

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 109, NO. 18

NEW YORK, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1943

NUMBER 1509

The Tide Rises

Disaster still threatens the German armies in southern Russia. The Red Army is driving for Perekop by way of fallen Melitopol, and for Odessa by way of Krivoi Rog. These drives if successful would trap the troops in the Crimea and the Dnieper bend, a total of about 1,500,000 men, according to the Germans' own statements. Even if the bulk of the Nazi army can be withdrawn before the double trap closes, the Germans will still have suffered a great blow, with further retreat made practically unavoidable. Nor have the Nazis been able to stem the steady, though costly, advance of the Allied armies up the Italian peninsula. In the Balkans Allied planes aided the Partisans of Yugoslavia by bombing the rail center of Skoplje. The bombing of Germany continues, and General Arnold points out that our losses are justified by the enormous destruction being dealt to German production. An offensive against the Japanese is threatened in Burma, and a raid on the Japanese base at Rabaul destroyed 60 planes and two enemy vessels. Predictions of an early and easy victory are still dangerous—everywhere the resistance of the Axis is sharp and their forces remain unbroken—but the tide of Allied victory rises inexorably.

The Moscow Conference

According to reports, the Moscow conference is going well, and it ought to go well. Yet everything that may be said about it now is pure speculation, since its deliberations must be guarded with the utmost

secrecy. Even after it is ended we shall probably know little more, because it is exploratory and preliminary in function. One important decision alone will indicate the degree of its success. If it leads to a conference of Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt, we shall know that it met no insuperable obstacle. If it does not, we shall be left to infer that it failed.

As far as war strategy goes, there is no major difficulty. Moscow wants a Western European front, and we are committed to one. The only disagreement can be about its timing. There is an area for possibly greater coöperation in military operations in the Balkans. As to post-war Europe, the Allies are not far apart in principle. All are committed to democratic governments, though there may be differences in the interpretation of democracy. We cannot effectively oppose anything the Soviet Union may insist on doing in the Baltic or Eastern Europe, though there is no sign that its demands in this area will be displeasing to us. The main subject on which disagreement may arise is, of course, the future of Germany. Russia has given a clear indication of her intentions in this respect, though Britain and the United States have not. Whatever happens, however, all three allies are bound not to make a separate peace.

The Nazis Turn Gloomy

Current Nazi propaganda is keyed to a woeful pitch. Facing what will undoubtedly be their worst winter of the war, the Germans are admitting their plight, stressing the seriousness of the military situation in Russia, the devastating effect of air raids and growing Allied

CONTENTS

The Week	603
Editorials	
Congress Forces the Issue	606
What the Workers Want	607
De-Isolationizing the Senate	608
General Articles	
Eisenhower Africanus Gallicus	609
War Orders and Peace Jobs Helen Fuller	612
Europe's Exiled Governments	
. Heinz H. F. Eulau	614
The Poor Are Still Poor Allan Spalding	617

Washington Notes T. R. B.	620
Othello Stark Young	621
Whimsy Gets the Whammy Manny Farber	622
The Bandwagon	623
Correspondence	623
Books in Review	
For Otis Malcolm Cowley	623
"Neither Jew Nor Greek" Alfred Kazin	626
Ring-Around-a-Rosi Heinz H. F. Eulau	628
Poetry of the Immediate William Poster	628
The Golden Legend George Mayberry	629
A Reader's List	630

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

strength in Italy. Curiously, such propaganda is intended to bolster home morale—if no longer with optimism, then with grimness, with the realization that only a desperate effort can stave off complete defeat.

But the present propaganda line is also serving another purpose. It is timed to meet the Moscow Conference, and while the Russians certainly need not be told that they have the Nazis on the run, Germany, by offering as black a view as she can about the war, may be subtly trying to dissuade the United States and Great Britain from committing themselves to any greater or different effort. Thus the Nazis have claimed that the damage caused by air raids has been a greater blow than defeat in Russia, while disaster at the Dnieper is explained by the statement that the war in Italy has drawn off a telling number of German troops from the eastern front.

These sad statements will undoubtedly go on. We shall most likely continue to hear rumors, Nazi-inspired, that Germany is about to crack and that the war will be over by Christmas. But the present Nazi propaganda line is apparently intended to convey chiefly one thing—that the cross-Channel invasion of Europe is unnecessary.

Wallace and Post-War Jobs

The American people have not yet awakened to the greatest danger that will face them after the war, but Vice President Wallace is doing his best to wake them up. They are afraid that there will not be enough jobs to go around, but they do not understand what will cause the scarcity of jobs. If we are to have an expanding economy which can supply the jobs, we must have abundant and increasing production. In order to have full production the first requirement is that private industry must sell at low prices, and reduce these prices as the cost of production falls. But that is just what private monopolies or quasi-monopolies do not do; instead, they stifle competition and restrict production in the interest of profits. And the war has strengthened the big producers and laid the basis for more monopoly than ever.

After a general attack on cartels in other fields, Mr. Wallace has now called attention to the monopolistic control of railroads. The railroads have recently had enormous earnings, which they have devoted in part to getting control of competing forms of transportation, by truck, air and water. And they do not compete among themselves, as far as rate-making goes. Mr. Wallace charges that they have kept rates artificially high, especially in the South and West. This prevents an extension of industrialization throughout the country. The Interstate Commerce Commission exercises little active control in rate-making. We are reminded that long ago Commissioner Eastman predicted that the only satisfactory solution of the railroad problem would be public ownership, because the American people

would not endure monopolistic control of transportation. This matter will bear close examination.

Anti-Semitism in Boston

PM's crusade to expose the vicious anti-Semitism that has been rampant in Greater Boston has resulted in Governor Saltonstall's appointing a committee of prominent Catholics, Jews and Protestants to investigate and advise him on how to deal with the problem. The Governor's action, however, came only after he had ordered out of his office the PM reporter who had made public the facts about Boston's anti-Semitism. We trust that the Governor's tardy recognition that a problem does exist will lead him to continue his efforts until the facts of a very nasty situation are spread before the public. It will not be easy. Every well informed observer knows that much of Boston's anti-Semitism has grown up because of the laxity, if not the connivance, of many highly placed individuals, clerical and lay.

Will the Blue Legion Change Color?

Generalissimo Franco's Blue Legion, fighting on Hitler's side against the Russians on the Leningrad front, has always been a hard fact for his apologists in America and Britain to explain away. About such intangibles as personality and ideology one might have differences of opinion. But the fact that Franco has had anywhere from ten to eighteen thousand picked men at any one time fighting against our Russian allies, and killing the very same people to whom we have been sending Lend-Lease supplies and upon whose military strength the fate of our armies in Europe will depend—such a fact cannot be glossed over by references to Franco's "works of peace" or estimates of him as a good and friendly man. Several weeks ago reports came from London that the Blue Division had been withdrawn and had come back to Spain. Time Magazine, in a not wholly friendly article on Franco, had repeated the reports as fact, and as proof that Franco was virtually on our side. But Alexander Uhl, writing from Washington for PM, now reports that the Blue Division has never been withdrawn, that it is still in Russia fighting the Russians and that its commander has just been given the Iron Cross by the Nazis.

Obviously this makes a travesty of the talk of Franco's new pro-Allied line. There are enough instances of puppet legions having been transformed into "volunteers" under the Nazi flag to leave room for the prophecy that the same may happen to the Blue Legion. If it does, both Franco and the British-American officials who are nurturing his present political fortunes would do well to know that the people of Russia, Britain and America will not be deluded by the false-face. If the Blue Legion changes color, it will have to be to something other than brown.

Some Spaniards on Archbishop Spellman

A group of Spanish professors in exile, meeting in Havana at a conference called by the University of Havana to study problems of the reconstruction of Spain, have published a very pertinent reply to Archbishop Spellman's letters in praise of Franco, which appeared recently in *Collier's*. The professors, among them José Giral, a former Prime Minister of the Spanish Republic, and Mariano Ruiz Funes, a former Minister of Justice, have very politely but effectively called Archbishop Spellman's sources of information into question.

They point out that the Archbishop made a very rapid trip through Spain. He was at all times kept from obtaining intimate knowledge of Spanish conditions. His very position of eminence no doubt kept him surrounded by Falangist dignitaries and Church officials—prejudiced sources, to say the least. The Spanish professors also answer Spellman's attack on the Loyalist government, reminding him that it was democratically elected, and thus represented the will of the Spanish people, and they further pointed out that the rebellion against the government, to which Franco and his generals, by pledging support of the regime, had sworn their loyalty, owed its success only to the assistance of "foreigners"—German and Italian intervention.

Perhaps the most ironic aspect of Archbishop Spellman's attack on the Loyalist government is that it constitutes another case of "foreign intervention." We regret that the Archbishop should at this late date add an intervention of his own—intervention of misinformation, misrepresentation and justification of fascism. It is remarkable that this spokesman for the Catholic Church, which claims to be so deeply rooted in the culture and popular traditions of Spain, should be unable to obtain, or unwilling to express, the truth that every Spanish layman knows.

Khmelnitsky, the Hero

Soviet Russia may well serve as a model for countries that have not yet solved the problems arising out of racial and cultural friction and the oppression of minority groups. We are therefore at a loss to explain her action in renaming the Ukrainian town of Pereyaslav, recently captured from the Germans. The name of the town was changed to Pereyaslav-Khmelnitsky, after Bogdan Khmelnitsky, a Cossack leader who waged a war for Ukrainian independence against Poland in 1648-49. In the course of his insurrection he carried on a full-scale pogrom against the Jews, slaughtering hundreds of thousands. So severe was the pogrom that Khmelnitsky's name has remained synonymous with murderer throughout 400 years of Jewish history, finally yielding only to that of Hitler.

We understand that Russia, in her growing nation-

alism, has been reviving heroic figures from the past to serve present war purposes. But if this be the reason for summoning Khmelnitsky out of ignominy—if not a desire to please Ukrainian nationalists—then certainly a shabbier hero could not be found.

Inflation-Bound

Apparently nothing can change the intention of a majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee to have open inflation or bust. In the last session of Congress, the members of this committee probably held the record for throwing obstacles in the way of the administration's efforts to hold down the cost of living. They have lost no time since the new session began in setting out to beat even that record. Already, the committee has voted to kill all subsidies after January 1. All the Republicans and four of the Democrats on the committee, including Chairman Henry Steagall of Alabama, voted for the anti-subsidy amendment submitted by inflation-minded Republican Jesse Wolcott of Michigan, which, if passed by the House, will mean an immediate increase in the cost of living of from ten to fifteen billion dollars.

A minority of ten Democrats vigorously protested the action. "This is the longest step toward runaway inflation any Congress ever took," Rep. Wright Patman declared. "It will mean increased prices, then increased wages and salaries, and then further increases in prices. It blows the lid off and invites unbridled, uncontrolled inflation. . . . It means we lose the home-



Cartoon in The New York Herald Tribune
A Maiden's Prayer

front fight. It is a complete victory for the Republicans."

Patman and the Democratic minority in the committee plan to lead a fight against the Wolcott amendment on the floor. But it is likely that the Republicans will win there too.

Remedying Post-War Concentration

Both Senators and Representatives are keenly alive to the problems revealed in Senator O'Mahoney's report on post-war industrial reorganization. More than 150 members of the two Houses met together recently to discuss ways of implementing Senator McCarran's pending resolution to create a select committee of the Senate to investigate the whole question of why American industry has not decentralized its operations into the West and South. Twenty-six states were represented in the group of congressmen who came together in the interest of further industrialization of their home areas. Westerners want to go to the mat on the question of developing steel and other industries in the West. Southerners and Westerners both want to go more fully into the problem of freight rates which discriminate against the industrialization of these "colonial" sections. John Coffee of Washington and Cecil King of California are the leaders of the House group for decentralization. Senator McCarran's resolution is the rallying point for this as yet most concerted move for full industrialization in America.

Back to Murder

One of the sweetest sights of recent times has been the glee with which the American daily press has been reporting the Nassau Murder Case. Here was a journalistic natural—a mysterious murder involving youth, beauty, titles, wealth, the tropics. Indeed, it is hard to believe that the whole thing didn't come from the pen of one of our professional authors of whodunits. The sigh of relief with which the popular press has swung over to the murder story is all but audible. Here is no complicated issue of international politics or post-war economic problems. Here is a good, juicy crime complete with leg-art, diagrams of the murder mansion, strange English courtroom procedure, yet near enough for the reporters from the New York tabloids to go down and telegraph back long articles about themselves, with the murder case as a background. No wonder they love it.

War Contracts and Monopoly

Sen. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, one of our best informed public officials on questions of technological and economic concentration, has submitted the report of his subcommittee on Industrial Reorganization to the Post-War Planning Committee.

It summarizes the extent to which the war-production program has advanced the progress of industrial and

economic concentration in the East and North Central states, where 62 percent of the war contracts have been awarded. And even more significantly, the extent to which war business has gone to big business—70 percent of the war business has gone to the 100 biggest business units, plus the government investment in plant facilities. For example, \$1,061,000,000 worth of plants have been awarded to du Pont and 100 plant expansions, to General Motors.

O'Mahoney warned that control of our economic system "has been concentrated both geographically and in terms of industrial units and that when "we undertake the task of reconversion after the war, we shall find large industrial units which now sit in the drivers' seats, in a position to dominate the new economy just as they dominate the war economy unless we continue government control in the transition period."

Congress Forces the Issue

IN HIS ANNUAL BUDGET MESSAGE the President told Congress that it would be necessary to raise \$16,000,000,000 more in taxes to close the inflationary gap. The Treasury, moderating its program to a chilly wind blowing from Congress, called for only \$10,500,000,000, although this would still leave excess consumers' purchasing power of \$7,000,000,000 or more. Yet the National Association of Manufacturers has recklessly advised the legislators that no further tax increase is needed, and the Republicans, with their allies among the Tory Democrats, have decided to heed their masters. If any new tax is voted, it will probably be a retail sales tax, recommended by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the reactionary press, but opposed by the administration and labor because it will, by raising the prices of necessities, start the very inflationary spiral which it was hoped could be avoided.

The country is thus given notice that unless a miracle happens, we are in for inflation. Economic stabilizer Vinson has warned us clearly of the obvious truth that price-control devices and attempts to stamp out black markets will not work much longer unless something is done to drain off the excess purchasing power of consumers. Even the price-control machinery itself is being sabotaged by Congress, which refuses to approve any subsidy program and fails to vote adequate appropriations.

Opponents of the administration are thus playing the cheapest and the most irresponsible of politics to put it in a hole. They do not care about the ability of the nation to win the war, or the consequences to the people in the future. Apparently they expect the taxpayers to thank them for declining to vote higher levies, and then to blame the administration when the cost of living soars. They know they are stimulating labor unrest, but if they can only get labor into a bitter struggle

against the administration, they may be able to win the next election. Nothing else matters to our congressional rulers.

It is at precisely this juncture that new threats of strikes arise from two powerful groups of workers whose output is basic to war needs—the coal miners and the railway workers. Both have been denied wage increases which they believe justified, and which their employers could afford to pay, because of the order to hold the line against inflation. Both have hitherto been forbidden to strike, either by the government or by their leaders, because of the need for maximum production. But the government has not kept faith with them. Congress has passed unenforceable and unjust anti-strike legislation, and now opens the doors even wider than before to rising prices. It is no longer a matter of the stubbornness of John L. Lewis, but of the disillusionment of millions of workers who believe that they have been sold out.

This is as ugly a situation as the nation has faced since the war began. It has the makings of a crisis far more serious than could be caused by all the saboteurs and disloyal tools of our enemies put together. Unless a way out is quickly found, our particular form of democratic system will have failed us in time of war. It has not so far been able to keep selfish interests in check for the sake of a sound fiscal policy, and it has not been able to put the national interest above the greed of politicians for power.

What is there to be done? The administration cannot permit serious strikes to occur. It has no actual power, even though it found a legal basis, to force large bodies of men to work if they decline to do so. Its moral authority to hold them in line has been stretched to the breaking point. This is not an occasion on which men can be allowed to strike, in the hope that they may be worn down in the end by unrelenting opposition. The only thing that remains is for the government to come to terms with the workers, in some way that will keep them satisfied and will not be too destructive to the war economy.

The first necessity is to abandon the "Little Steel" formula. This was based on the assumption that the rise in the cost of living could be stopped short where it was at the time the formula was announced. But the Republican Party, the National Association of Manufacturers, *et al.*, have now made this assumption untenable. Wages will have to be increased as the cost of living goes up. Furthermore, the rise cannot be measured by a single percentage covering the whole nation. Prices have behaved very differently in different localities and, as a committee of expert statisticians who have studied the subject recently pointed out, different indices should be calculated to cover the different circumstances.

In many cases, because of increased overtime, actual earnings have risen enough to cover the rise in the cost

of living or even more, even though wage rates have not been boosted. But such earnings are paid for hard work, and are at least as well earned as the incomes of farmers and business men, both of which have risen to unprecedented levels because of the war. Furthermore, overtime is not equally distributed among the workers, and cannot justly be substituted for increases in the basic rates of pay where these should be adjusted to a higher price level. What is necessary here is a plan to keep the excess purchasing power from affecting prices and markets. Congress evidently will not do it through taxes, but it may be possible to negotiate with unions and employers some plan for tying wage increases to a sufficient war-bond-buying program.

It will not do for the administration to start a stubborn warfare with labor on the basis of its months' old formulas. The country cannot endure such a struggle, and these formulas have been ripped to ribbons by the enemies of both labor and the administration. The President's advisers must rethink, and quickly, their program for wages and prices. For they have lost the battle against increases in the cost of living, and therefore the battle against increases in production costs. They will have to form new lines and conduct the best rearguard action which is possible in the circumstances.

What the Workers Want

TWO OF AMERICA's biggest war industries—coal and railroads—are again in the throes of strikes or projected strikes. The coal miners want the acceptance of the contract embodying wage increases on which they agreed with the Illinois operators, and its extension through the whole industry. The railroad unions want the restoration of a wage award granted them by a Railway Labor Board panel, afterward cut in half by the War Labor Board, on the ground that it broke through wage ceilings.

This is not a healthy situation from any viewpoint. Without coal the big furnaces cannot roar. Without them, steel plate cannot be turned out at the mills, for ships and armament. Without transportation, the nation's whole war economy loses its arteries. Obviously these dire events will not happen; but just as obviously the fact that they are even threatened by patriotic workers shows the impasse that has been reached in American labor policy.

It shows, above all else, the utter failure of Congress' attitude toward wartime labor, as expressed in the Smith-Connally anti-labor act. For this act, while pretending to maintain the forms and machinery of collective bargaining, makes a virtual farce of it. The railroad workers, for example, are about to go through the mumbo-jumbo of voting on the question of a strike. The strike sentiment among them is reported as being overwhelming. Yet if they vote a strike, the next step

—according to the act—is to have the President assume formal control of the road, thereby making the strike illegal and subjecting the leaders to a jail penalty. When the strike threat has been broken, the industry is then handed back to private ownership and private profit.

Clearly this involves the use of government forces, under an extremely thin disguise, as the instrument of labor policy. And if anything should by now be obvious to the leadership of the democracy, it is that force will not work where it seeks to freeze injustice and where the grievances are real.

It cannot be denied that they are real enough. These are crucial industries, and the men in them undergo the rigors of a war economy under tremendous tension. In this sense, they are real soldiers of production. But their wage rates have not been increased to keep pace either with the harsher conditions of employment or with increases in other industries. Whatever may be said of wage increases in relation to inflation, they should proceed with some sort of justice. There must be a balance within the wage structure.

The problem of these workers is therefore the problem of second-class citizens. And force itself will never solve this problem. It may, in the immediate future, drive it below the surface. It may succeed in getting the Alabama coal miners back to work without a substantial wage increase, and in keeping the railroad workers on the job without a substantial wage increase. But a problem driven below the surface is not a problem solved. And when the energies of workers are driven below the surface, those energies do not go into the work itself. No one will pretend that coal will be mined as well or the railroads run as well by sullen and embittered men, as they would be by men who felt that they bore an equal burden with the rest of the nation, and no more than an equal burden. The way to treat second-class citizens is not to impose on them the full and sole harshness of governmental power. The way to treat second-class citizens is to make them into first-class citizens.

De-Isolationizing the Senate

THE DECISION OF THE Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, by a large majority, to report favorably the Connally resolution on international coöperation ought to lead to its prompt passage. Since the House of Representatives has also passed a similar measure, Congress will then be on record in favor of participation by the United States in international organization to safeguard future peace.

We say that the decision of the committee to report the resolution will lead to its prompt passage, because the isolationists on the committee almost unanimously supported it, and those in the Senate who agree with

them will probably do likewise. But this at once raises the question how much the resolution is worth. Are the American people and our allies entitled to take heart from a promise to which these gentlemen are willing to commit themselves? The true proponents of international action to restrain aggression in the future, of full coöperation with Britain, Russia and China, and of a strong United Nations, wanted a substitute with stronger wording, and this was turned down by the committee. Nevertheless the resolution adopted, though more vague as to the use of force, is on its face internationalist in tendency. In lieu of something better, it was favored by those who have supported the administration on foreign affairs from the beginning. It does commit the Senate to some action of a nature which one-third plus one of its membership voted against after the last war.

The action pretty clearly means two things. One is that isolationism pure and simple is dead. The temper of the country is such that the proponents of complete separation from the rest of the world did not dare to hold their ground. It does signify something that they did not kill the whole measure, or propose a draft which would have been completely satisfactory to The Chicago Tribune. But also they hope, when the time for detailed implementation arrives, to render the promise as meaningless as possible in terms of specific action.

They are fighting a strategic retreat, and the struggle is by no means over. Already The New York Daily News has spoken favorably of an alliance with Britain, not because it loves Britain more, but because it loves Russia less. What is needed now is strong leadership from the President and the Secretary of State in favor of a more concrete proposal, so that an informed public opinion may push the isolationist Senators further back. They must be prevented from pouring their fervor into an Anglo-American imperialism after the war.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, ISAAC ROSENFELD

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

Eisenhower Africanus

"In this country," said a French liberal who had watched the events in North Africa and played a part in some of them, "you often hear that Eisenhower is a good general or even a great general. But you have to take most of his achievements on faith, because, for military reasons, you were never told the real nature of the difficulties he had to surmount." When we asked our visitor to explain, he wrote the article that follows. Some of the material it contains will be completely new to most American readers. — THE EDITORS

WHEN Eisenhower made his famous agreement with Darlan, he solved the first of the problems that faced him when his troops landed in North Africa. It was an unsatisfactory solution, implying commitments that were dangerous for the future; but for the present it meant saving time and lives. Eisenhower's troops would meet with no more resistance from the French African armies. There were, however, four other problems he had to solve one after the other.

1. *Would there be a civil war in Algeria?* — For more than two years, the Vichy government had been setting Frenchmen against one another. Some through self-interest, others by political conviction or a thirst for revenge against the People's Front, still others through fear or the desire to conform, had been following the instructions of Marshal Pétain. An intense propaganda for the new order, together with an active police force that persecuted dissenters and instituted a reign of terror, had imposed on all the inhabitants of North Africa an imitation of Nazism and a spirit of submission to defeat, a collaboration with the enemies of yesterday and a servile obedience to the occupying authorities. Appealing to false patriotism and the spirit of reaction, Vichy had assembled a horde of *ersatz* Nazis and had organized them into the French Legion of Fighters, corresponding to the German storm troopers; and there were also shock troops known as the SOL. These bands were given arms, with the approval of the German-Italian armistice commissions. Progressively they were charged with the duties of political surveillance, war against the resisters (who were also known as de Gaullists, though not all of them were partisans of de Gaulle), denunciation of suspects and universal espionage.

The French, however, were slowly regaining their self-confidence and were recovering from the moral wounds of defeat. Against Pétain's "national revolution," they began to feel a violent hatred that was intensified day after day by the broadcasts from London. No other radio station was ever listened to with

such a hungry faith as BBC. Great numbers of Frenchmen were dreaming of revenge against everybody concerned in the Vichy persecutions. In darkness and secrecy, they were preparing themselves for the great night of retribution. Some of them, in a frenzy, talked about ruthless punishment for the Legionnaires and instant death for every member of the SOL.

For a few days after the end of the fighting, French patriots were wholly occupied by the joy of greeting their liberators. Soon, however, the spirit of vengeance reappeared. Many of the resisters hoped that the Americans and the English would encourage or at least tolerate the liquidation of fascist institutions and of the fascists themselves. On the other hand, the Vichyites and their shock troops, after being stunned for a moment by the rapid arrival of Allied troops, began to raise their heads again, thinking that Darlan would protect them.

At this crucial moment, we began to hear more about General Giraud, the escaped prisoner from Königstein. The public had known little about him—merely that he had written a letter to his children urging them to resist and that his escape had driven Hitler into a rage—but these facts were enough to make him extremely popular among pro-Allied Frenchmen. The army knew more about Giraud, including the fact that he had played a brilliant part in the Moroccan wars; most of the officers were willing to accept him in his new post as commander-in-chief of the land forces. Soon it began to be said that his political opinions were reactionary, even anti-republican, and this reassured the Vichyites. Giraud himself was careful to announce that he cared about nothing except winning the war and driving the invaders from French soil. Eisenhower greatly strengthened his position by giving him public and private support.

As a popular idol, Giraud was able to play a double role. On the one hand, he satisfied the resisters, since their principal desire was to resume the struggle against the Nazis at the side of their allies. On the other hand, he calmed the fears of the Vichyites, who were hoping above all to escape the vengeance of their adversaries and to save as much as possible of the "national revolution." Weeks went by in this deliberately nourished state of ambiguity. Meanwhile passions were dying down, thanks to the popular relief at being liberated, and thanks also to the resumption of war against the Germans. The Allied troops continued to land, and a new Franco-Anglo-American police force was maintaining public order. Civil war had been avoided.

It is easy to understand that Eisenhower hoped nobody else would come—especially not de Gaulle—to set Frenchmen at odds again and sharpen the conflicts

among them. For the moment, he had solved the first of his new problems by giving Giraud his support and by entrusting him officially with the duty of maintaining order.

2. *Would the natives revolt?*—Both Mussolini and Hitler had made great efforts to conciliate the Moslem world, hoping to rally the Arab tribes against the English and to create difficulties for the French in North Africa. Their propaganda pictured Italy and Germany as nations friendly to all Mohammedans. The Arabs were skeptical about the Italians, remembering what happened to their own kinsmen in Tripoli, but they accepted the friendship of the Nazis, whom they regarded as their allies against the English and the French. Besides being impressed by the military power of Germany, they were corrupted by German gold.

Vichy indirectly helped this campaign among the Arabs, by insisting that France had deserved her defeat and by proving, in any case, that her government had no will to resist the invaders. In November, 1942, most of the Arabs were still more or less sincerely convinced that Hitler would win a more or less speedy and overwhelming victory. The Berlin radio made its chief appeal to anti-Semitism, always endemic in North Africa. In fiery words it urged the Arabs to resist the "protectors of the Jews," who were planning to establish the reign of Israel in North Africa, "as they had already done in Palestine"—another good talking point with the natives. Never backward with promises, the Berlin radio and the Nazi agents on the scene prophesied that the Wehrmacht would make another thunderbolt campaign and push the Allies into the sea.

At this juncture the Governor General of Algeria, Yves Chatel, who had made himself popular among the Arabs by his demagogic speeches and by following anti-Semitic policies after the departure of General Weygand, flew back from Vichy in a military plane. Setting up his headquarters in an inland town some 250 miles from Algiers, he called upon the Moslems to wage a holy war against the Allies, with the benediction of their "friend," Marshal Pétain.

Eisenhower authorized Giraud (and perhaps advised him) to order a general mobilization of French and Arabs, a measure that impressed even the most fanatical of the natives. He also found a way of dealing with Governor Chatel, a corrupt official who was beginning to be frightened by the prospect of being arrested and punished. Instead of sending an armed force against him, Eisenhower gave him permission to resume his office under Allied protection. Chatel accepted, and at once launched into public appeals for calm and discipline—in contrast to the appeals for insurrection he had been making a few days earlier. Eventually Chatel was dismissed, but not before he had served his purpose.

Eisenhower had meanwhile shown that he under-

stood the maxim of Marshal Lyautey, the great expert in controlling the Arabs: he paraded his strength to keep from having to use it. American and British troops, with their splendid new equipment, marched through the streets of little cities in Morocco, Algeria and western Tunisia. In a few weeks, Eisenhower had ended the threat of a holy war. The Arabs concealed their liking for Hitler and kept themselves at a prudent distance. The most impoverished of the natives, the rebels by necessity, were given food and clothing. Many were hired to unload Allied ships and help build fortifications.

3. *Would the Germans and Italians be able to use their fifth column?*—Eisenhower's intelligence service knew that the various German-Italian armistice commissions had been extremely active, in spite of Weygand's attempt to keep them within bounds. It was clear that they had made contacts with disaffected elements, and also that they had placed agents where they could be useful to the Axis. There was danger of widespread sabotage, and military information was reaching the enemy through secret radios.

In this field, Eisenhower displayed great activity. He made use of elements in the French police force that had been working, even in Vichy days and under the watchful eyes of the armistice commission, to circumvent the efforts of the German and Italian secret agents. Under his instructions, swift and energetic measures were taken to sap the strength of the fifth column, which was soon rendered almost harmless. By granting his confidence to patriotic Frenchmen, Eisenhower had once again found the quickest solution.

4. *Would the Germans immediately take the offensive, and could they make a swift advance from Tunis before the Allied troops were strong enough to check them?*—They had strong bases in Sicily, Sardinia and the south of Italy, and some of their best troops were stationed there. Moreover, they had to act quickly if they wanted to keep Rommel from being caught between two fires. On November 8, at the first news of the Allied landings, the German General Staff gave orders to occupy the airfield at Tunis, which was the nearest to Sicily. Then they waited five days, partly because they had been taken by surprise—a fact which was obvious to every observer on the spot—but chiefly to see whether the Allies would also land in Tunisia. On November 13, the Germans began bringing over an army from Sicily, which they reinforced day after day with remarkable speed.

This was at the moment when Americans at home were wondering why their army hadn't advanced into Tunisia. On the contrary, the Germans thought that they could move faster than the Allies; and they even spoke of occupying Bône and Constantine in Algeria, before sweeping down on Algiers itself with the help

of Rommel's army. That army was preparing to evacuate Tripolitania, a province which had proved too difficult to defend and supply.

The danger was immediate. Eisenhower speeded up the landings and decided that he could depend on the French troops that were entrenching themselves in the mountains of Tunisia. He took the risk of establishing bases far to the east of Algiers and, in spite of heavy bombardments by Axis planes, he landed as many troops as could be spared at Bône and Philippeville, only 300 miles from Tunis. He did more than this. He appealed to Giraud to reinforce the French troops in Tunisia with others from Algeria and Morocco. He appealed to Admiral Cunningham, the commander of the Allied fleet, to arrange for landings as near as possible to the firing line. By all these measures he checked the Germans and won the battle of speed. He forced the enemy to abandon his offensive into Algeria.

These were Eisenhower's chief problems, during that first autumn, but he solved other problems too, with the same mixture of prudence and celerity. His prestige kept growing week by week. The British troops and their generals obeyed his orders in a spirit of true collaboration. Giraud, who paid little attention to internal politics, assumed all civil and military powers, and meanwhile collaborated wholeheartedly with the Americans. So did Admiral Cunningham, whose fleet had seized control of the Mediterranean. Without any shrill display of authority, but skillfully, patiently and stubbornly, Eisenhower had made himself the deciding voice in all North Africa, not only on the military plane but in politics as well. Three months after landing in Algiers, he had created a highly efficient military machine and had caused his authority to be accepted without ill feeling.

The political crisis and the popular unrest that followed the assassination of Admiral Darlan, at the end of December, 1942, might have destroyed the equilibrium that Eisenhower had established. By that time, however, he had already mastered the situation to such an extent that he was able to surmount the dangers of the next few weeks. With his characteristic prudence, he refrained from putting himself forward and from using his authority. He was satisfied with advising Giraud and waiting to see how things developed.

In February, 1943, another grave crisis presented itself. While political unrest was increasing among the French of North Africa, while they were accusing the Americans of preventing a return to democracy and of favoring the authoritarian government of fascist-minded people that continued to exist under Giraud, and while the foreign press was beginning to be seriously concerned about Giraud's reticence as to internal policies—at this moment the Germans in Tunisia launched an offensive that disturbed the military leaders and frightened the civilian population. The Arabs

regained some of their confidence in the Nazis. There were many acts of sabotage and many reports of parachute landings. Eisenhower said nothing for publication, but he held several conferences, with results that soon became apparent.

On March 14, Giraud reestablished the laws of the French Republic. He made a speech officially disowning totalitarianism, the dictatorial spirit and the Vichy government. The Axis offensive was checked just short of the Algerian border. There were several changes in the high command of the Allied armies. Eisenhower had acted again. His authority after the crisis was stronger than ever, his prestige even greater.

By the end of March he had gained sufficient confidence to act with all the forces at his disposal. People had learned that Eisenhower never struck till the blow was ready. The saying was that he organized and didn't improvise. His prudence and coolness inspired confidence in everybody except a few of the more impatient. Paying no attention to the criticisms that were being directed against some of his colleagues, Eisenhower launched his April offensive in Tunisia. And those who watched the preparations that were being made and saw the Allied military machine in action knew that the first American victory was certain.

It came sooner than anybody expected. I have heard Eisenhower blamed for not giving enough credit to the American troops who fought at Mateur, since this was the battle that led directly to the German collapse in Tunisia, but he knew what he was doing. He took great pains to make it clear that the Tunisian victory had resulted from the collaboration of all the Allies. Prudent Ike, as his associates called him, was becoming an astute diplomat.

All his diplomatic talents, all his prestige and power, would be needed in a crisis that he had managed to defer until victory was won. The question who should rule the French empire, which was then being debated all over the world—and debated much too vehemently, to Eisenhower's way of thinking—would have to be answered in Algiers. Everybody was waiting for the arrival of General de Gaulle, an event that should lead to the unification of all the Free French who were fighting on the side of the Allies. This arrival, for many months expected, announced, desired and feared, had become inevitable.

Eisenhower regarded Giraud as a friendly and loyal collaborator and wanted to have him retained as commander-in-chief with full powers. Otherwise he feared that his own organization, created with patient care, might be seriously weakened. Any new troubles in North Africa would hinder the movements of his armies at a moment when he was preparing to invade Sicily and the Italian mainland. At first, however, he merely watched the development of the crisis, holding his power in reserve. Then, at the end of June, he

came forward for the first time and consented to speak to the press. He affirmed his love for democracy and his faith in republican institutions. He declared that the army under his command would fight to deliver the world from fascism and Nazism. This was the atmosphere in which the French Committee of National Liberation was founded.

After several stormy days, Giraud and de Gaulle reached a general agreement except on one point, that of military command and the retirement of the older officers. Eisenhower, in his present and future plans, had reserved a place for the French army; and he was utterly opposed to radical changes in its leadership, organization and equipment, thinking that these would be certain to cause delays and might affect the spirit of the troops. At last he began to exert his powerful influence. He told the National Committee that the direction of military affairs would have to remain in Giraud's hands.

Meanwhile Eisenhower was becoming disturbed by the sort of attention being paid in other countries to the quarrels between the de Gaullists and the other Free French. With his mind wholly occupied by preparations for invading Europe which he could not yet reveal, he found it difficult to understand why the world's attention should be focused on the more or less ill tempered negotiations between two French groups, both of which were eager to fight the enemy and liber-

ate their own country. There were, he thought, too many newspaper correspondents in Algiers. He managed to have some of them recalled and others instructed to devote most of their attention to military affairs.

Once again, Eisenhower had solved a problem, but this time with greater difficulty and not without some hurt feelings. Neither his prestige nor his influence was diminished in the least; but whereas they had formerly been all the more effective for being kept in the background, the decisions of June, 1943, had given them wide publicity.

All these events that took place in Morocco, Algeria and Tunis are henceforth part of history. With the battle raging in Europe, North Africa has become merely a supply base and military headquarters for the invasion of the Continent. Nevertheless the African experiment was of decided importance for the future conduct of the war. It marked the beginning of a new era, when the Allies would seize the initiative and the Germans would fight on the defensive. With certain reservations, one can say that the experiment was successful. One thinks of the greater Scipio, who also won a battle at Zama, or the plains of Tunis, and wonders whether Eisenhower, too, has earned the title of Africanus.

GALLICUS

Translated by Malcolm Cowley

War Orders and Peace Jobs

WHEN THIS WAR BEGAN, there were a number of manufacturers in this country who had not yet been paid off on World War I contracts. This time, if we are to move from war to peace without sliding off into another period of serious unemployment, one of the things we must work out while the war is still going on is a speedy and just system for terminating war-production contracts so that business will be assured enough working capital to shift easily and quickly back from military to civilian production.

Small business men will naturally have a larger proportion of their limited financial resources tied up in war work at the end of hostilities than will big business. It will therefore be especially important to them to avoid all possible delays in unfreezing their capital so that they may compete with large manufacturers in the contest for post-war civilian markets. But both big and little business want and need a government program for reconversion which will include liberal loans and advance payments on terminated contracts.

On November 11, 1918, the War Department had \$7,500,000,000 in contracts outstanding. United States war agencies actually terminated about 32,000 of these separate war contracts, valued at \$5,000,000,000. It

took on the average three and one-half years to settle each claim that went to court on appeal. Our war production program in this war amounts to more than ten times that of World War I. Today it is estimated that there are 250,000 prime contracts outstanding; approximately 800,000 subcontracts in the first tier, with the second, third and fourth tiers of subcontracts running into the millions. The cancellations that will come with the end of the war will soon mount up to about \$75,000,000,000. Claims will come pouring into government offices, with every claimant demanding immediate settlement, for cash on the line to be used for starting up peacetime production. If his claim gets tangled up in government forms, his plant may not be able to get back into operation fast enough to prevent disastrous unemployment.

At the height of the last war, expenditures rose to one-sixth of the national income. This year, our war production program is costing us more than 60 percent of our all-time-high national income. As these tremendous bills come due, it will be up to the government to double-check each item and carefully verify the totals, regardless of the fact that the creditor is howling for his money.

Around these two questions, speedy payment versus just settlement, the war-contract-termination problem still revolves. Up until now, contracts have been terminated by the procurement agency which originally entered into the contract (War, Navy, Treasury Departments, or the Maritime Commission). The War Department alone has already canceled about 9,000 contracts, wholly or partially, valued at about \$5,750,000,000. But there has been no definite policy for handling these terminations. The War Department policy, which is generally followed by other agencies, is to let its contracting officers in the field offices, who usually negotiated the contracts in the first place, negotiate the settlement with the prime contractor, subject to certain higher review.

Comptroller General Lindsay Warren has now stepped in with sharp objections to the present situation on terminations. He contends that the General Accounting Office must have the final say on contract settlements. An open fight on this issue is now raging between the War Department and the GAO. Major industry plans for reconversion will stand still until the fight is settled.

The War Department is asking Congress for legislation sanctioning the continuance of its present termination methods with added power to make its settlements final and the GAO audit purely rubber-stamp in character. The Department claims that it has all the necessary power now under the First War Powers Act, and that it is only asking for reaffirmation of these powers because the Comptroller General is questioning them. Those familiar with personnel in this sector of the armed forces know that sometimes this present system might result in having a former official of Company Z, now in uniform, sit down with another official of Company Z, not in uniform, to terminate the war contracts of Company Z. By the terms of the "War Department Accounting Manual for Fixed-Price Supply Contracts," it is the contracting officer's "sole responsibility to negotiate a settlement with the contractor. . . . The findings of the accounting personnel are for the general guidance of the contracting officer and do not limit that officer in arriving at what he considers to be a proper settlement."

Comptroller General Warren has been filling a good many newspaper columns recently with his denunciations of the War Department position on this question. He has charged that military contracting officers are so lax in their auditing procedures that they have permitted war contractors to claim as war costs, reimbursable by the government, such items as spare false teeth, vitamin pills and juke boxes. Warren told his former colleagues of the House of Representatives that too many of the contracting officers had indulged in "wining and dining with contractors and that as a result they had a tendency to be more 'liberal'"; and also that the Department's present regulations for ter-

minating contracts will actually be used in many instances "to cover up fraud. . . . The contracting officers' determinations of the amount to be paid will be based largely on the contractors' representations as to the amounts owing. . . . I am convinced that the contracting officers will allow improper payments which, perhaps, will total millions of dollars."

The issue that has been joined between Warren and the War Department is not, however, the true issue so far as the public interest is concerned. The problem requires a much more detailed solution. Speedy final settlement of war contracts must arise out of uniformity of policy and procedure of settlement among the various government agencies and must be supported by a program designed to provide quick, short-term financing in advance of settlement for the smaller manufacturers in need of ready cash for reconversion. The Small Business Committee of the Senate has done the best job thus far in spot-lighting these and other questions and seeking to synthesize the various agency opinions on them. But as yet it too has only scratched the surface in its presentation of findings. Careful congressional inquiry followed by specific legislative proposals is clearly called for in this case. Some months ago, Senator James Murray (Democrat, Montana), chairman of the committee, introduced a basic piece of legislation in this field to provide for the mandatory loan of 75 percent of the amount claimed by the contractor within 30 days after the claim is filed, with the provision that if claims are later found to be too high, the excess is to be returned at 6-percent interest. This bill was drafted with the needs of small business especially in mind.

Very recently Senator Murray, in collaboration with Representative Wright Patman, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, has introduced another measure to help little business over the reconversion hump. The new bill would give the Smaller War Plants Corporation a major role in war-contract termination. Under this proposal it would be possible for any small manufacturer with a canceled prime contract to go to his local or regional Smaller War Plants Corporation office and get an immediate loan to cover the money due him from his still unsettled war contracts. Senator Murray and Representative Patman, on introducing the bill, stated that:

Without a program of this type, thousands of small business concerns will be unable to contribute their utmost to the war production effort . . . to get off to a proper start in the post-war economy. . . . The present contract-termination program is woefully inadequate to meet the needs of small business. Instead of getting back the money he has laid out, the typical small business man whose contract is terminated will get a dizzy runaround. If he hopes for quick final settlement of his claim or an immediate advance payment thereon, he is due for a rude awakening, especially if he holds a subcontract. If he goes to a bank

for a V-loan, he may be tied up in prolonged negotiations or turned down.

All these criticisms of present methods are legitimate ones. The War Department system now in use and its proposed future system of termination work to the great advantage of the big business holding big prime contracts. Less than 500 companies have been awarded 75 percent of the War Department's business. To equalize the post-war opportunities of other producing units with those of these 500 major contractors, still more legislation will be needed—to speed up final settlement of claims, to provide for settlement of claims on a

company-by-company rather than contract-by-contract basis, to provide for advance and partial payments, to extend V-Loans to cover all aspects of termination financing, to protect rights of small manufacturers in the course of contract settlement and to provide for a central agency or commission to coördinate the policies of the various procurement agencies and to guarantee proper appeal from decisions of those agencies.

It is up to Congress to begin its study of this vital question now and enact the necessary legislation without delay if we are to come out of this war with a productive, smooth-running economy.

Washington

HELLEN FULLER

Europe's Exiled Governments

LONDON ON THE EVE of the Moscow conference bustled with feverish diplomatic activity. The Polish government-in-exile drafted an *aide-mémoire* for Mr. Eden. The memorandum demanded for Poland the boundaries she had held at the outbreak of the war. The Czecho-Slovakian government-in-exile once more informed the British Foreign Secretary that it insisted on making a treaty of mutual assistance with the Soviet Union. The Yugoslav and Greek governments-in-exile announced from Cairo a number of territorial claims against Italy. Shortly before his departure, Mr. Eden held a final conference with the Foreign Ministers of Norway, Czecho-Slovakia, the Netherlands, Belgium and Poland.

What does all this diplomatic hustle and bustle mean? It means that all of the so-called governments-in-exile are fully aware of the fact that their interests are at stake in the Moscow conversations. They also know that, for the first time since their exile, their policies and their interests will be subjected to close scrutiny by the main Allied actors sitting in common council.

The claim of some of the exiled governments to speak for their peoples under the German yoke is not only doubtful, but in some instances a blatant misrepresentation of fact. Learned dissertations have been written to prove that the governments-in-exile are the only legal representatives of the nations conquered by Germany. But is the principle of legal continuity a politically acceptable device to judge representativeness? Is it indicative of the support or influence the governments-in-exile have at home? Despite their efforts to maintain contact with the homeland, the exiled governments may easily be out of touch with their peoples, whose terrifying experiences may drive them in a direction altogether different from the political aims of their governments.

These considerations, while relevant to all the governments-in-exile, are particularly applicable to the

governments of Yugoslavia, Greece and Poland. The final explosion of the Mihailovich myth has not only clarified the picture of the political situation in Yugoslavia, but may be helpful in throwing some light on the claims of the Greek and Polish governments-in-exile. It explains the special concern of these governments over the discussions at Moscow. Soviet Russia has consistently supported the Partisan movement in Yugoslavia whose strength the Yugoslav government has continuously sought to minimize. Similar situations may well exist in Poland and Greece. Russia's outspoken hostility toward the Polish government-in-exile may well spring from the knowledge that the latter has very little to stand on, as far as support at home is concerned, in pushing its demands for a restitution of the 1939 boundaries. The Greek government finds itself in much the same position. All three governments know that the Moscow conference will ask some embarrassing questions before making any recommendations or even decisions.

On the other hand, the governments-in-exile of Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway and Czecho-Slovakia need not fear the Moscow parley. Their political record is clean. They have no particular axes to grind. Their leadership at home seems uncontested. Their democratic aspirations are genuine. Excepting unforeseen circumstances, they will return home. They will hold elections and abide by the results. Would the exiled Yugoslav, Greek and Polish governments do the same? What has been their record? How democratic and representative are they? What are their motivations? What are their prospects of returning home?

The now pitilessly disclosed pretensions of the Yugoslav government have turned out to be a major propaganda hoax of the war. For more than three years its clever publicity agents, with the aid of gullible English and American newspapermen, succeeded in attributing the exploits of General Tito's Partisan army almost exclusively to General Draha Mihailovich. Why did

the Yugoslav government claim completely unwarranted credit for Partisan successes? Because it is anxious to conceal its real intentions. Paying lip-service to democratic ideals, the Yugoslav government in reality continues the reactionary, undemocratic and Serbian-nationalist program of the old Belgrade *charshiya*, that small group of the privileged few who have dominated Yugoslav politics ever since King Alexander established a dictatorship by his coup d'état of 1929.

The only aim of the former Yugoslav ruling clique is to return to power. For this reason they ordered General Mihailovich, one of their own, to refrain from fighting as much as possible and preserve his forces, not for the day on which, as the claim goes, he will assist the invading Allied armies, but for the day on which he will have made Yugoslavia a safe place for the exiled ruling clique to come back to. This plan may come to naught. Tito's army is growing steadily. Mihailovich's forces are demoralized and disintegrating.

It is interesting to note, therefore, that the Yugoslav government-in-exile has a second plan. This plan has not as yet been given any publicity. But it is ready, and if circumstances should make its use feasible, it will undoubtedly be pushed. The plan, in short, is to make acceptable to the Allies the Serbian Quisling, General Milan Nedich, whose role would be similar to that of Darlan in North Africa and Badoglio in Italy.

The Yugoslav government stands for everything that the Yugoslav people fight against. Its main program, apart from discrediting the Partisan movement, is the creation of a new Greater Serbia. This would include a large part of Croatia. In order to sell this program to the Allies, promises have been made for the establishment of an independent Croatian state north of Zagreb which in reality would be nothing but a Serbian puppet. The Partisans, on the other hand, want a republican federation in which Serbia would be a constituent member with the same status as Croatia, Slovenia, Montenegro and possibly Albania. This federated Yugoslavia would undoubtedly be on good terms with the Soviet Union. For this reason the Yugoslav government is eagerly trying to denounce the Partisan movement as "Communist." While it is true that General Tito is a Communist, that other leaders are Communists and that there is much enthusiasm for the Soviet Union in the Partisan army, it should be emphasized that the political branch of the Partisan movement, the National Anti-Fascist Council, is headed by the non-Communist Dr. Ivan Ribar, the prominent leader of the Independent Democratic Party. Moreover, the vast majority of the Yugoslav peasant masses and bourgeoisie is non-Communist.

In contrast to this truly popular, but not "legal" government inside Yugoslavia, the "official" Yugoslav government-in-exile is thoroughly undemocratic and unrepresentative. The most recent cabinet shuffle brought into the government a group of political non-

entities, reactionary diplomats and officers, headed by Bozidar Purich. Its "non-political, neutral" character is only a screen. In reality the present cabinet is thoroughly political. It is a pawn in the hands of such consistent Greater Serbs and supporters of the pre-war dictatorship as Milan Gavrilovich of the Agrarian Party, Milosh Trifunovich and Momchilo Nincich of the Radical Party, and the non-party Slobodan Yovanovich. For reasons of political expediency these politicians at present prefer to remain in the background.

The British government, aware of the real situation inside Yugoslavia, finally found the presence of the Yugoslav government in London embarrassing and decided to rid itself of the nuisance by sending it to Cairo, a theatre of war, where it will be much easier to control its activities. At the present time the British are in immediate contact with the Partisan movement over the head of the Yugoslav government.

The refugee Greek government, sharing with the Yugoslavs the fate of exile in Cairo, is in very much the same position as far as the possibility of its return to Greece is concerned. Symptomatic of its political weakness is the agreement of last July between the Greek People's Army of National Liberation (or ELAS) and the British. By this agreement the three principal Greek guerrilla units placed themselves under the command of General Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, the United Nations Middle East commander. The Greek government-in-exile had nothing to do with the agreement.

As a matter of fact, the government of Prime Minister Emanuel Tsouderos is hardly known to the people of Greece. It is as unrepresentative as the dictatorial Metaxas cabinet which had ruled the country with an iron hand from 1936 until a few months before the German conquest. In its propaganda it has obscured, for pretty much the same reasons as the Yugoslav government has tried to conceal the strength of the Partisans, the important role played by Greece's real political force, the National Liberation Front (or EAM) and its army. Recent reports, from Cairo to the effect that fighting has taken place between the various guerrilla groups in Greece may well be inspired by the Greek government in its effort to discredit the EAM and drive a wedge between the guerrilla forces and the British. For the EAM is composed of all the elements which once opposed the Metaxas regime and now have little sympathy for the Tsouderos government. It includes many clergymen of the Greek Orthodox Church whose part in the war of resistance has been magnificent indeed. In Crete the Liberation Army is led by Colonel Mantakas, an outspoken anti-royalist.

When Prime Minister Churchill in his Quebec address of August 31, 1943, expressed his hope of seeing the kings of Yugoslavia and Greece "restored to their thrones by the free choice of their liberated peoples,"

he made his wish the father of his thought. Although King George has promised free elections for a constituent assembly upon his return to Greece, the EAM does not want the King back at all, at least not until after the elections. To judge from reports that have come out of Greece, the majority of the people want a popular democracy. Their sentiments are shared by a large sector of the Greek army in the Middle East which is in close contact with the EAM, and even some cabinet members in the Greek government-in-exile are reported to look with disfavor upon a restoration of the monarchy.

Somewhat different and more complicated is the case of the Polish government-in-exile. In the first place, it is a coalition government composed of all pre-war parties except a group of extreme right-wing Pilsudskiites, on the one hand, and the Communists on the other. Second, it has strongly developed contacts with the home country, maintained chiefly through couriers and messengers from the Socialist labor movement and the Jewish minority. Third, its politics are kept in constant turmoil by its difficulties with the Soviet Union.

There are no outstanding men in the cabinet. Its greatest asset is the support it receives from the Polish Socialist Party, whose Jan Stanczyk is Minister of Labor. Its greatest liability is the presence in the cabinet of a number of nationalistic reactionaries and anti-Semites such as Dr. Marjan Seyda, Minister in Charge of Preparing the Peace Conference, Professor Wacław Komarnicki, Minister of Justice, and Mgr. Zygmunt Kaczński, Minister of Education. Prime Minister Stanisław Mikolajczyk, who succeeded General Sikorski upon the latter's death, was a political nonentity prior to the assumption of office. Stanisław Kot, the Minister of Information, a former ambassador to the Soviet government, which accused him of engaging in espionage, is the most pro-Russian—if that attribute is permissible at all—member of the Polish government.

What holds this weird combination together? Their mutual fear and hatred of the Soviet Union. In this respect the Polish Socialists do not differ greatly from their reactionary compatriots. Of course, they have some good reasons for this. Only recently the execution in the Soviet Union of two prominent Polish Socialists, Ehrlich and Alter, added fuel to the ever smoldering fire. On the other hand, as some well known Polish democrats in the United States have pointed out, by their unwillingness to adopt a more reasonable attitude toward the Soviet Union the Socialists are playing into the hands of the reactionary clique which dominates the government's foreign policy.

The death of General Sikorski was a serious blow to the cause of friendly Soviet-British relations. It practically nullified all the efforts previously made to solve the problem of the Russo-Polish frontier. The part of Poland occupied by the Soviet Union in 1939

included an almost hopeless mixture of Poles, Ukrainians, White Russians, Russians proper, Jews and a number of smaller groups of indeterminate nationality. The problem of finding an ethnically adequate frontier is further complicated by the fact that the Poles generally predominate in the towns as, for instance, in the city of Lwow, while the surrounding country is largely non-Polish. In view of the already accomplished uprooting of the population, a further exchange of population certainly represents a possible solution.

But Sikorski's death aggravated a situation which had already led to a rupture of diplomatic relations. It was immediately seized upon by the reactionaries to strengthen their position and appease the extreme rightists outside the government, by pushing through the appointment as commander-in-chief of Kazimierz Sosnkowski, an avowed follower of former dictator Pilsudski and a convinced enemy of the Soviet Union. Moreover, by insisting on a full restoration of the pre-war Russo-Polish boundary the Polish government-in-exile may be digging its own grave and possibly that of Poland. Its efforts to convince the Anglo-American powers of the righteousness of its claim, without giving an indication of willingness to compromise, are doomed to fail. For it is unlikely that London and Washington will jeopardize Soviet post-war collaboration by defending the Polish demands.

However, the real key to Polish-Russian relations is not the boundary question, but the future constitution of the Polish state. The Soviets want a friendly Poland. The present Polish government, with its reactionary and anti-Soviet personnel, will never please Moscow. A change both in composition and policy will be necessary before the Soviet government will reopen negotiations. To achieve this through Anglo-American intervention may well be a Soviet objective at the Moscow conference. The position of the Soviet Union is fairly strong in this respect. It may point out to the Anglo-American representatives that there is a wide discrepancy between the democratic demands of the Polish underground as formulated, for instance, in the "Manifesto of Freedom" of 1939, and the personnel and policies of the present government-in-exile.

Particularly objectionable to the Soviet Union is the Polish plan for an Eastern Federation which, so the Soviets charge, is directed against Russia. But the break in Polish-Soviet relations really dealt this plan the death-blow. The Czecho-Slovakian government immediately declared that it would have no part in such a scheme and turned to Moscow for a treaty of mutual assistance. Since then, according to the Soviet charges, the Polish government has sought to assure its return to Poland by directing the Polish underground, known as the Center of Civil Resistance, to keep active military operations against the Germans at a minimum. The purpose of this policy, the Soviets say, is to save up arms against the Russian-supported Partisan under-

ground when the liberation of Poland has been achieved. It is true that the Polish government has ordered many guerrilla bands to disband and to preserve their strength until the moment of liberation has come. But the reason it offers is that guerrilla activities now involve a useless waste of life and endanger the local civilian population against whom the Nazis have been applying the stratagem of collective responsibility.

All of these considerations suggest why the Yugoslav, Greek and Polish governments-in-exile are greatly disturbed by the discussions at Moscow in which they were not asked to participate. While no decisions concerning their claims will be made at Moscow, the discussions may nevertheless have far-reaching effects on the future of these governments.

HEINZ H. F. EULAU

The Poor Are Still Poor

AMERICANS who have been dazzled by our \$147,000,000,000 national income, and misled by it into assuming that the war has produced a chicken in every family pot, were jolted when a recent OWI press release announced that 20,000,000 people are receiving inadequate incomes. Their shock would have been even ruder had they been told that this was probably a conservative estimate.

Since the OWI release covered only fixed-income groups, it failed to include several million people whose incomes have advanced, but not enough to cover increased living costs, and those whose incomes have actually declined. Moreover, it was based on a partial survey which omitted low-income workers in manufacturing and on farms. Incomplete though it was, the release served a useful purpose: it demonstrated to the public that, although the present war boom is the greatest this country has ever known, America's low-income groups still constitute a major economic problem.

Several separate governmental studies on low-income groups, of which the OWI release was only the vanguard, are furnishing proof that our low-income problem cannot be dismissed so easily. These studies are being undertaken by Social Security, the Food Distribution Administration and the OPA. Social Security officials have confined their attention mainly to soldiers' dependents as a special low-income group. The FDA and OPA projects, however, are more comprehensive, and attempt to take up the study of our national income distribution where the late National Resources Planning Board left off. All are "confidential" so far, but the FDA is planning to release shortly a report based upon one of its studies, and Social Security is about to issue a study showing the effects of the suspension of the food-stamp plan.

In their present stage the FDA studies, which give the most accurate picture of our entire low-income group, indicate that about 19 percent of our people apparently do not have enough money to maintain subsistence health standards.

Two subsistence budgets have been considered by FDA economists as criteria for determining which of our families should be considered low-income. One is a WPA budget for a four-member manual worker's

family. This budget covers food, clothing and shelter, and would cost a family about \$1,624 a year. The other is a minimum nutritional diet, developed by the Bureau of Home Nutrition and Home Economics and priced at \$565 a year for an "average" family. Although this is a few dollars higher than the food diet provided by the WPA budget, it is a better gauge, since the WPA diet doesn't take individual nutritional needs into account. Government nutritionists consider that the BHE diet is the lowest possible subsistence gauge, in terms of family health.

Only average families with a yearly income of \$1,675 or more spend a large enough percentage of their incomes to obtain this minimum diet. The average single person, for whom the BHE diet would cost \$160 a year, cannot afford to buy it unless he earns an annual income of at least \$350. Below these income levels, food expenditures on the part of families and individuals are extremely low. For example, an average family making as much as \$1,200 a year (and this includes more than 20 percent of all our families) spends only \$492 for food each year, or about \$140 a person. Expenditures are even lower in the South.

Using a 1943 income distribution drawn up by the OPA, FDA economists estimate that more than 10,000,000 families are now making less than \$1,675 a year, and more than 500,000 single persons are failing to earn \$350. About one-third of these families are probably living on farms, where many of them are able to grow their own food. Assuming that all farm families get an adequate diet—which is highly doubtful—this leaves an approximate total of 25,000,000 persons in cities who are not able to buy the food necessary to sustain minimum health.

Going down the income ladder step by step, these economists estimate that close to 6,000,000 non-farm families, including about 20,000,000 people, have annual incomes of less than \$1,250. The average family income below this level is \$750, which usually means a family food expenditure of \$300 a year. About 3,000,000 non-farm families fall below this amount. Statistics covering the lowest tenth of our families, where the average income is \$464 a year, show that around 1,750,000 non-farm families fall within this category.

Because the present studies are in a preliminary stage, these figures can only be accepted as rough estimates. But they should certainly be an antidote for overoptimism on the part of those who believe that the war has resulted in a more equal distribution of incomes. For they show that the highest 3.6 percent of American families, with an average yearly income of \$20,000, earn as much as the combined annual income of 50 percent of all our families. The upper 26 percent make more each year than all the rest of our families put together.

This probably cannot be accepted as the entire answer, since current government studies take only the money income of each class into account. The influence of certain "invisible" factors in augmenting the real income of families and individuals, should not be overlooked. Free educational and recreational facilities, and other services offered by government and private organizations, often make a real contribution to the benefits which lower-income families can obtain. But the balancing influence of these intangible additions to the well-being of low-income families is, at best, limited—especially in wartime.

Exactly who are the people who make up these lower-income families? According to Social Security, the FDA and the OWI, they may be classified into seven major groups:

1. Recipients of Social Security benefits whose needs cannot be met by their monthly checks. Many old people, blind and crippled persons depend entirely on Social Security payments for their income. These payments are intended merely to supplement a person's regular income. In several states the rate of payment has been considerably reduced since we entered the war.

2. Unemployable persons who are ineligible for Social Security benefits. Among these are disabled veterans and their relatives, retired state and municipal employees, part-time workers, dependent children, invalids, people living on life-insurance annuities, private-charity cases and people deprived of relief when the federal works programs went out of existence.

3. Soldiers' dependents. This is certainly one of the most significant groups, both from the standpoint of size and national morale. According to the OWI, it includes about 9,000,000 people, a large proportion of whom rely entirely on government allowances for their incomes. To illustrate the inadequacy of allowances made under the Servicemen's Dependents Act, Social Security has undertaken a study showing that in San Francisco, a woman living alone can barely manage to survive on \$67 a month, and a wife and two children cannot live on less than \$108. Yet the draft allowance for a woman alone is \$50; for a wife and two children it has been \$72 (the House has just voted to increase the allowance for the first child by \$18 a month, with \$20 a month more for each additional child). Class B dependents—parents, brothers, sisters, etc.—receive

even smaller allowances, but their needs are often as great as those of Class A dependents.

4. Federal, state and local government workers in the lower wage brackets. Although the average federal government wage is \$2,200, there are a large number of employees whose incomes fall below this.

5. Workers in private industry who receive insufficient wages because they work in nonessential industries which cannot afford to pay higher wages, or in traditionally low-paying industries. As an example of the first, The New York Times recently reported a shortage of white-collar workers because of their large-scale emigration to war plants in search of a decent living wage. An instance of the second is the hourly wage of a laundry worker in Washington, D. C.: 32 cents. The recent ruling of the WLB, enabling certain employers to raise wages to 40 cents an hour without asking the board's approval, may help somewhat to alleviate the condition of some of these workers.

6. Underpaid farm workers. Our farmers as a whole are enjoying unprecedented profits, but many tenants, migrants and seasonal workers are still living below subsistence levels.

7. Workers in war industries who are beginners, or happen to be unorganized or unskilled. In certain essential industries such as lumber and sawmill, coal mining and food processing, wages are often too low to cover increased living costs.

The constant rise in food prices has hit these various groups particularly hard. In its June Price Control Report, the OPA listed price increases from January, 1941, to May, 1943, for 65 foods entering into the cost of living. This entire group showed an average weighted increase of 46 percent. But the 15 low-priced staple foods on which low-income families normally rely, showed an average weighted increase of 80 percent. In other words, our lowest-income families are having to increase their food expenditures much more than middle and upper-income families.

The entire low-income dilemma is, therefore, an urgent wartime problem. It challenges the success of our attempts to stabilize and equalize living costs, as well as our efforts to obtain an equitable distribution of food supplies under our war food program. It also places the effectiveness of our entire production program in a rather dubious light. Certainly we have not reached "full production" when 19 percent of our people, many of them employables, or unemployables who could be rehabilitated, receive inadequate incomes.

This problem, with all its vast ramifications, demands immediate recognition on the part of our policy-making officials. Only a comprehensive, well integrated government program can meet the needs of our lower-income groups, and steps should be taken to work it out.

There is disagreement among economists as to the exact form such a plan should take. Some feel that our low-income problem could be adequately met

through a redistribution of invisible income. Prof. Alvin Hansen, for instance, has advocated a program to redistribute income via steeper corporate income and excess-profits taxes, sharply progressive estate taxes, broadening of the individual income-tax base together with steeply graduated surtax rates, compulsory savings and a "qualitative shift in the components of consumption." Such a plan should be put into effect. But though it would considerably expedite the war effort, it would not, by itself, represent an adequate short-term solution to our low-income problem.

The FDA report, about to be released, presents a more direct and realistic approach. The economists who wrote it suggest a positive government program of assistance, implemented by a plan to utilize more fully the productive efficiency of our low-income groups.

The core of their program would be a strong central subsidy. This subsidy might take one of two forms, or preferably both: a vigorous over-all price rollback, involving the subsidization of all income groups, or a differential subsidy somewhat similar to the food-stamp plan, affecting only the dependent groups.

The advantage of a straight rollback is that, from the standpoint of the low-income groups themselves, it is the simplest way of increasing purchasing power. In England, where aid to low-income groups was made an integral part of the food program early in the war, this subsidy has been used very successfully. But to be even moderately effective in lowering prices to low-income groups in this country, a straight rollback would have to go far beyond the programs we have had so far.

A differential subsidy, requiring the use of food stamps, would have greater flexibility in reaching the lowest-income groups. Its practicability has already been demonstrated by the food-stamp plan. Under this subsidy, extra purchasing power (food stamps) would be given to people with insufficient incomes.

The FDA report stresses that the production plan for low-income groups, which should go hand in hand with the main subsidy program, would have three phases: the more efficient utilization of low-income workers already employed, the education of blind, crippled and other "unemployable" persons to do essential war work, such as bandage-rolling for the Red Cross; and finally, the employment of seasonal workers in community canning projects and other essential work to fill in their periods of inactivity.

The FDA's low-income program would be rounded out by various other measures designed to raise the nutritional standards of low-income families.

Chances for congressional approval of such a program seem to be pretty slim right now. Several bills designed to aid specific low-income groups have been proposed, of which the Herter bill presents the best preliminary approach to the over-all problem of government assistance. The Herter bill stipulates that only persons whose family incomes have not risen more

than 20 percent since January 1, 1939, shall be eligible for payments. This would include about 30,000,000 people in cities and on farms, most of them making less than \$1,500 a year. Economists who have analyzed the bill believe it would cost about \$750,000,000.

Before Congress adjourned last July, the bill's backers announced that it would not be reintroduced in the present session.

A compromise bill was prepared by Senator Aiken in July. In their efforts to obtain the bill's passage, its originators decided on a compromise with the anti-subsidy groups. They inserted a clause stipulating that if the bill were adopted, all other subsidies, including rollbacks, would be prohibited. They also scaled down the amount of money which the bill would appropriate to low-income groups. The unfortunate result of this maneuvering is that the Aiken bill, if passed, would represent a substantial victory for the subsidy foes in Congress, but would provide only partial assistance to low-income groups.

The Aiken bill would increase family income by the issuance of food stamps, which would leave families free to purchase other things with the money they formerly spent for food. Certification of eligible families would take place through local rationing boards, with the help of responsible local citizens, and an extensive publicity campaign would be undertaken. About 18,000,000 families would be included under its provisions, at a cost of around \$2,000,000,000.

Before Congress adjourned last July, hearings on the Aiken bill were scheduled to be held before the Senate Agricultural Committee this month. A few weeks ago, however, these hearings were abruptly canceled. The only explanation given to government economists who have been trying to improve it, was that "the time is not ripe" for such a bill.

So, despite the fact that international assistance to low-income groups was a major keynote of the recent Food Conference, the present political and official attitude toward this problem is cold. But sooner or later Congress, faced by the alternatives of accepting subsidies or wrecking the entire economy by abolishing them, will be forced by popular opinion to continue them.

In the meantime, our low-income problem should not be forgotten. Its solution is not just a wartime necessity, but an argument for post-war "full production" in America. If we fail to obtain a more equitable income distribution in order to abolish want among certain segments of our population, we will, in a large sense, have lost the peace. The National Resources Planning Board proposed several exciting possibilities for an economy of abundance. We must explore these possibilities and try to achieve "a society in which everyone capable of working and willing to work can find an opportunity to earn a living, to make his contribution, to play his part as a citizen of a progressive, democratic country."

ALLAN SPALDING

Washington Notes

Mostly Politics

THE BIG PUSH has started here against the whole Roosevelt economic front. The Treasury's \$10,500,000,000 tax-increase program has been junked and timid Secretary Morgenthau is away inspecting the Mediterranean instead of fighting at home. The House Banking Committee has voted against all subsidies, come next January, save those on peanuts and cottonseed, grown in Chairman Steagall's home district. The farm bloc is set for a full-scale drive to substitute all-round higher farm prices for anti-inflationary subsidies. The National Association of Manufacturers which, reactionary though it is, ought to know better, has come out against any more taxes, of any kind, at this time.

The present fight will decide whether the price front can be held and the black market controlled. It is the background for the President's subsidy message. Every inflation hurricane warning has been raised: national, individual and farm incomes are all at record highs, so are corporate profits and personal savings, so are funds in circulation. The gap between money to spend and goods to buy grows greater daily. One extraordinary phenomenon is the reversal of roles: Mr. Roosevelt, regularly denounced by the better element for fiscal irregularity, is today champion of the orthodox hard-money school of higher taxes; his Tory opponents, like the NAM, are recklessly bent on leading the nation down the primrose path.

Mr. Willkie strengthened his political position here last week at his off-the-record talk with Republican congressmen, and also at St. Louis. The self-confident note he is striking is peculiarly designed to impress hesitating congressmen. The very truculence with which he cracked down on would-be hecklers of his own party at the meeting here, though termed "arrogant" by opponents, reassured the timid. Such boldness, they argued, indicates surety of position. But Willkie still has a long way to go. To begin with, even yet, he has not mastered the technical tricks of his trade. He had only half an hour on the air for his St. Louis speech. Instead of trimming it to fit the time, he elected to race through it. By so doing he forced the St. Louis audience to check its applause, and failed to make his points, as he might have over the radio. Even so—he did not finish on time. Still more important for Willkie is another factor—the Dewey enigma. Last week there was a cordial exchange of telegraphed courtesies between the two. This was interesting because till recently they have hardly been on telegraphic, let alone speaking, terms. This may mean that Governor Dewey has really abandoned the race. But most careful observers still feel that if Dewey wants the nomination he can have it. The Old Guard prefers him. Willkie, of course, argues that Dewey must break his pledge to continue as Governor in order to win the nomination. Dewey seems to be waiting to see if the nomination is worth having. Mr. Willkie is out in front, putting on a good show, but exposed and vulnerable.

The Senate defeated the federal aid-to-education bill, 53 to 26, in one of the most tricky and tragic episodes seen here in a long time. Anyone with imagination must be moved by the heart-breaking discrepancy between Northern and Southern schools. In the world's richest country, millions of children are denied their heritage. The defeat was accomplished by inserting the Langer amendment, raising the whole race issue, and of course designed to kill the bill. The amendment provided that there should be no discrimination in the use either of the proposed federal, or existing state funds, between schools for whites and Negroes. The amendment, laudable enough in its wording, was actually a trap and was detected as such by Negro organizations, which urged its defeat. It was enacted by three votes, 40 to 37, dooming the bill. What impressed me, looking down at it from the gallery, was the slickness by which the political trick was put over. The Republicans, led by Mr. Taft (who sent his own children to a private prep school with \$1,200 tuition), first denounced the educational measure as an invasion of states' rights; then they shouted through the Langer amendment, which was the very essence of an invasion of states' rights. Having done this, they turned on the bill they had just amended, and pigeonholed it. Two courageous Republicans, Aiken of Vermont and Burton of Ohio (Mr. Taft's colleagues), deserve credit for refusing to join the trick. Otherwise the Republicans voted solidly for Langer's amendment. It is possible that some Senators were deceived. But on checking the votes I find that 28 members—19 Republicans and 9 Democrats—first voted for the amendment, and then turned about and showed their real feelings by voting to kill the measure. Fear of federal invasion of local education, and the omission of parochial schools, brought the strong Catholic lobby out against the measure, and it is significant that of the nine Democrats cited above, the majority were Catholics.

Pudgy-faced Henry Kaiser is built something like Billikin, but a Billikin with a projecting jaw. He was, in effect, on trial before the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee this week on the serious charge of having "appeased" labor in the Brewster hearing. I have watched Mr. Kaiser many times. He is a fascinating figure. He has fat cheeks, faint jowls, big wrists, pudgy fingers, a bald head and a barrel chest. In addition, he has an overwhelming—a consuming—passion for production. And he believes that you should "work it out, instead of fighting it out," with labor. Mr. Kaiser won his argument with the committee, and made some of the members look silly.

Sumner Welles was offered the job as ambassador to Moscow, but declined because he could not work with Hull; what he is now tactfully declaring is that the administration has been tragically remiss in not giving the nation proper leadership in post-war policy. . . . Willkie charges that George Sokolsky wrote Missouri Republican Queeny's tricky questions to put to him. . . . A confidential poll of United States soldiers in Britain shows them overwhelmingly Democratic. . . . The Connally post-war resolution is full of escape clauses; it will mean only what public makes it mean.

Washington

T. R. B.

Othello

Othello. Shubert Theatre, October 19, 1943.

AN ARTIST like Mr. Robert Edmond Jones, working completely on his own, would doubtless give this tragedy of Shakespeare's a full splendor, an audacity and a texture of Venetian Renaissance and wonder. That would mean a brilliant scope in the visual scene and in the costumes, close to the magnificence of the play, and, so far as I know, impossible to find in the British theatre, and in our entire theatre, only completely possible at the hands of this one designer.

Such scope was not to happen in this Margaret Webster production of "Othello" that the Theatre Guild presents. A scheme has been adopted of shifting units that serve from scene to scene—palace, seaport, street, castle or bedroom, Venice or Cyprus. The scheme proves effective for some of the play's scenes, confining and concentrating the dramatic action and impact, but for others the limitations are serious. In the death scene, for example, even a bare stage with curtains at the back would have been better than that crowded and ignoble passage of love and death, with its packing and squirming among players and motifs and its scattering realism. Not even that, however, can defeat the combination of concrete passion and lofty, cleansing abstractions of which this incredible scene is composed.

The costumes for "Othello" are for the most part cut to the reservations of the scenery and rather on the Bronzino or Florentine side than Venice. Everything is in good taste, as might be expected, and now and again a costume breaks through the discretion into the distinction of style that Mr. Jones has for the mere asking at his fingertips. Cassio's costume is an example, as are Othello's, though Mr. Paul Robeson lacks the instinct and phrasing for wearing costumes *per se*. Bianca's clothes come off with a bang, joyous, bouncing, truly Venetian, though, in spite of Titian and Veronese, it takes here a whore to let us have any fun with the costuming.

Mr. Jones's lighting of "Othello," meanwhile, is superb, so secure that most of the audience must take it for granted. No other designer in our theatre has so final a use of lighting, so much confirmed, such beautiful values and dramatic truth created.

It might be said that this décor for the play parallels, or shall we say allays, the production that Miss Webster has given it, though the décor, of course, has the advantage of being to a certain extent in the hands of one person only instead of the impure blend of divers elements that go to make up the theatre art, not to mention the fact that the designer in this case is the leading genius in our theatre. Miss Webster is a theatre worker of much ability, honesty and good sense, not to say perseverance—her production, for example, of "The Trojan Women" two years ago was so banal a horror as would have laid most directors flat forever. She evinces no bad taste; only, if you like, a quiet absence of taste. Her theatre virtues are solid and respectable; what she lacks is the esthetic sense. (To define that statement would take pages, largely wasted and ending in false issues and confusions.) The thing to say about Miss Webster and our theatre, our Shakespearean theatre especially, is that we ought to be thankful that we

have her at all, remembering the while the Irish proverb that the least ugly daughter is the family beauty, and the Latin one that in the realm of the blind the one-eyed is king. Miss Webster's productions are not by any means of the topmost rank, but they have a good breeding, good sense, literalness and sincerity that carry them, and deservedly, a long way both as entertainment and as box-office.

"Othello" must be one of the half-dozen great dramas of the world, certainly of our known Western world. It has a perfection of structure and content that is the marvel of all study. But so far as modern audiences go, this play has three difficulties to overcome. First of all, it exacts of course a cerebral response from us that we are by no means accustomed to—democratic principle combined with business methods has led us steadily into the easier and easier, the trashier and trashier even, any way you turn. Second, the conception of woman's position with regard to the male is hard to take, though subconsciously it may be easier for us than we choose to think. And, third, the theme of jealousy is the least attractive aspect of sex. The triumph of the play over these difficulties is to a certain extent a measure of its triumph as a work of art.

In the present production a good deal of cutting has gone on in the interest, doubtless, of speed, time, what not, and the whole play has been divided into two acts instead of Shakespeare's five. Together with this, the acting is on the restrained side, if you like to put it that way; the truth is that it does not go in for eloquence, fire or the high tragic style, and no play of Shakespeare's, "King Lear" excepted, has so great a need of these as "Othello." A part of its complete excellence is that its content is expressed in its form and its form is entirely inherent in its content. You can do what you deem expedient with this or that play of Shakespeare's, but not with "Othello." Its perfection, idea, technique and impact are inextricably bound together. Handled otherwise, the play suffers from a seeming incredibility. The melodrama of the situation and the tautness of the dramatic moment are deprived of the right stylistic and emotional support. A part of the greatness of "Othello" resides in its very nearness to the incredible, the forced, the sounding brass. It is perilously near to its own obverse, to what it is not. I am not sure but what that is one way of describing greatness in art.

Miss Webster's performance of Emilia furthers in general the point of the above. She plays as usual very competently and with real intelligence. She should now add two things to her performance, two things for which Shakespeare himself has supplied a more than definite basis: in the scene with Desdemona, when the latter is preparing to go to bed, Emilia should be more bawdy, as her speeches indicate, and in the death scene a little later she should be more noisy and frantic—the very lines she has to speak require that. As Miss Webster does these scenes now, she throws away, in the mistaken interest of restraint, the magnificent opportunity that the dramatist so very patently has provided. As for the company on the whole, Miss Webster has put a very fair degree of the fear of God into them, so that they read their lines metrically and, since Shakespeare is here at his best, to make sense. The sole exception in this case is Mr. José Ferrer's Iago in his first scene, where much is to be set forth and where even a close knowledge

of the play left me wondering what on earth those lines were about, as his diaphragm went on pumping the words out.

As to Mr. Ferrer's Iago—all Iagos are sure to be praised and, if not so, are blamed at Shakespeare's expense—it could be said that his scenes had poise, stage punch and a determined longevity. I was not surprised, however, when one of our most noted editors expressed to me some wonder as to whether, not having seen the play before, he should take the character of Iago as credible. Iago is credible only to the extent to which we are led to fall in with his cerebral excitement, his non-moral temperament and magnetism and his enjoyment of his own self and his own variety. Mr. Ferrer needs badly and first of all a more distinguished presence, more elegance, more Renaissance Italian. And he should remember that there is no monotony in Iago's brand of evil.

Thanks to Miss King herself, to the director and the costume, Miss Edith King is the first of a number of Biancas I have seen to get the character into its proper dramatic line, its importance in the play's pattern. For all the fluff and insouciance, it would be stupid to take this performance of Miss King's too lightly: we have few actresses indeed who could give the role exactly the touch-and-go weight that we have from her. Miss Uta Hagen, with that curiously flexible talent that may carry her far in our theatre, is one of numerous Desdemonas that I have seen, what with stage and opera versions these many years. She is the best of them all in my judgment. Without as herself seeming blind or innocuous, she gives that pearl-like quality that Shakespeare intended. She unfailingly establishes the scene.

That brings us to the portrayal of Othello by Mr. Paul Robeson, a role he presented some years ago to London audiences. The fact that the actor in this case is a Negro has no direct bearing on the subject, since Othello was portrayed as black up to the nineteenth century when critical romanticism changed his color to the Arabian. The Italian original of the story uses the word *negrezza* to describe him. Mr. Robeson, a singer of distinction, still lacks for this role the ultimate requirement, which is the fine tragic style. By virtue of true feeling and intensity of soul he has its equivalent at times; and then he is moving and deep. There are two things that I would suggest. One is that he recast, as it were, his first speeches in the play, and a number of others later on, where he is too aggressive vocally, has too much projection of the tone, gives us the wearing sense of an overworked diaphragm where only the relaxation of dignity and strength are required. In the scenes that call for more emotion or decision his voice is very fine, unrivaled on our stage.

The other suggestion I would give Mr. Robeson has to do with style, the elusive matter of stage bearing, so important in this part, as his acting often shows. In the scenes of despair he crumples up into a defeat far too domestic, gentle and moving though it may be. He must discover a style, remote but equally pathetic, for these moments. Otherwise his performance is admirable, is noble, tender and rich in scope. It has no little of the depth and stretch of music. And underneath it constantly there is a kind of spiritual humility that is akin to grandeur.

STARK YOUNG

Whimsy Gets the Whammy

FLESH AND FANTASY," Charles Boyer's first movie as producer-actor, is a picture with the theme that dreams, the occult and any wishes you may have floating around you are big as life and twice as handsome, and with some morals like faith in yourself will drive the pixies away; do evil things and you will look as ugly as Hitler; you can make your dreams come true if you try—none of which, unlike *Lassie*, comes home. It is a chaotic smorgasbord of meshed-gear thinking and bad movie-making but it is also interesting. Movies with deep thought, morals and the occult, or anything except physical action, are as rare this year as hen's teeth, and especially so when containing the gushing energies and naïveté of Mr. Boyer's film.

"Flesh and Fantasy" is one of those four-in-one movies, which Boyer's director, Julien Duvivier, continues laboriously to love, where four little movies are hung from the thread of one of those awesome ideas you get in the middle of the night, such as, it just goes to show what funny tricks life can play, and in which Mr. Duvivier plays Mr. Fate or fairy godmother to the studio's star list. Here the thread—read in three stories by David Hoffman (the gnomelike man who played Radek in "Mission to Moscow") to dream-fearing Robert Benchley—is the idea that dreams and palm-reading aren't to be tossed off frivolously, nor, on the other hand, accepted wholesale. In the first one, a mean, ugly slavey, who is about to commit suicide, is given a dose of Lloyd C. Douglas oil—do good and you'll look good—and a beautiful mask to wear to the Mardi Gras for two hours. So she shelves the mean role for the time, has a beautiful spirit for two hours, and gets a real, live fella and a beautiful face (Betty Field's). In the second act a talented palm reader, played by Thomas Mitchell, tells the lawyer, played by Edward G. Robinson, that he will eventually be a murderer. And after Fate robs the lawyer of two likely prospects who will not be missed by anyone and by their death would have relieved him of his Fate, he gets hysterical and murders the palm reader! The third act concerns a tightrope walker (Charles Boyer) who has a dream in which he falls from his rope. For the next three reels he has quite a time with his tightrope walking.

The main thing about the movie is its chaos. Actually the idea of the validity of the corporeal and non-corporeal as expressed in the title runs consistently enough through all the stories, but it has been used as a gullible, unimaginative person would use a patent medicine he has been told will work on everything from the common cold to rickets if he uses it often enough and doesn't ask any questions. The first episode, except for a couple of early, noisy dashes somewhere, is a straight, if trite, moral fable; the second and third, which are better simply from being more than a radio skit accompanied by scary, watery snapshots, have only a touch of morality, but enough to confuse everything, and their strokes of fate occur unrestrainedly whenever they are needed to keep a superficial story going. Then the clever ending turns up, and you are left, having witnessed two long, dull stories spiced with heavyweight sleight of hand, with nothing at the end and having been neither surprised, enlightened nor excited in transit. The material it uses, which is so old and undistin-

guished, is not heightened by its supernatural jazz, and the result of the jazz projects no meanings, emotionally or intellectually.

Mr. Duvivier's movies, which are so intoxicated with whimsy, are in themselves extremely pedantic affairs, unimaginative, and lacking in lightness, taste or charm. When the palmist tells Lady Mildred Platz that she will soon hear from her husband whom she hasn't heard from in seventeen years, the radio answers immediately that someone bumped into the missing Arctic explorer, Harold Platz, at the North Pole and that Platz would now address his radio audience. You can't blame Lady Platz for fainting. The material of the movie is the prim, stuffed-shirt elegance of an era even Hollywood has forsaken, when heavy, obvious sentiments were expressed with extreme seriousness and enthusiasm. The shipboard romance between the tight-rope specialist and the reformed diamond thief, which ends with the girl being led off to prison and her tightrope lover beamingly awaiting the day when she will be paroled, will make you feel old. Betty Field contemplates suicide with the persistence of an air drill and Mr. Robinson does his victim in with enough force and perspiration to kill a battalion of palmists—yet not for one second do you feel you are seeing anything but a particularly enthusiastic character actor's rehearsal. At no place is the treatment imaginative enough to justify whimsy. Mr. Duvivier's wand is like a crank.

MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

The proletariat has no quarrel with bankers because the poor never come into contact with bankers. — *From "Topics of The Times" in The New York Times.*

Generalissimo Francisco Franco said tonight that "in this supreme hour of universal anguish, Spain may consider herself among all the nations of Europe as the supreme refuge of civilization." — *An AP dispatch from Madrid to The Los Angeles Times.*

May the Day Come Soon—when our Forests and Fields shall hear the tread of peaceful steps, and our Rivers and Lakes shall feel the quiet dip of the oars as American youth returns victorious to enjoy again the freedom of the great outdoors, and Marble's Outing Equipment. — *An advertisement in Sports Afield.*

Democracy in Action—New York Division

Eighty-eight Negro children began their new school life in Hillburn at 9 yesterday morning. State Education Commissioner Stoddard ruled last week that the big, well equipped public school was open to the Negro kids. He said they need never return to the ramshackle Brook school in the gully under the highway.

Staff and supplies were waiting for them. But almost to a man, the white parents withdrew their children from the Hillburn Main school. Out of 69 white children, one sixth-grader, Joan Krusieski, showed up for school. Joan was from Ramapo, a nearby town where folks aren't so stirred up about the school question. . . .

White parents reported that Malcolm Stead, a Hillburn house painter who said he spoke for the white community, made a house-to-house canvass yesterday to tell parents, who might not

be able to afford tuition at the private Suffern School, that fees would be taken care of. — *From PM.*

Total-War Department

A thirty-three-year-old father of eleven motherless children was reclassified as 1-A today by Local Board 27-B [Stamford, Conn.] and is expected to be called up for induction in the armed forces some time in December. — *From The New York Herald Tribune.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; \$1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. — THE EDITORS

Correspondence

The Utilities' Swollen Profits

SIR: My attention has been called to an article in the October 4 number of your magazine, entitled "The Utilities' Swollen Profits."

Since the utilities' profits have been shrinking rather than swelling for the last dozen or more years, the title of the article shocked me so that I looked up the facts and beg to report as follows: The largest gross corporate income (balance after deduction of operating expenses, depreciation and taxes) in the history of the electric-utility companies was for the years 1930 and 1931, each of these years showing about \$979,000,000. Every year since then has shown less gross corporate income than this maximum, and for the year 1942 the figure was approximately \$809,000,000.

In the meantime, however, the investment in the business from 1930 to 1942 grew from \$12,850,000,000 to about \$15,000,000,000, so that, whereas the \$979,000,000 of 1930 showed gross corporate income of 7.6 percent on the then book value of investment, the \$809,000,000 of gross corporate income in 1942 represented only 5.4 percent on the then \$15,000,000,000 of investment.

Do you not feel, therefore, that a decrease of 29 percent between the maximum year, 1930, and the last year, 1942, in the rate of return on investment, as shown by the above figures, would be more accurately described as shrunken profits than swollen profits?

Not only have the profits shrunken, but the average residential rate per kilowatt hour from 1930 to 1942 was cut from 6.03 cents to 3.67 cents, a decrease of 39 percent.

C. W. KELLOGG, President,
New York City Edison Electric Institute

SIR: My article in The New Republic of October 4, the title of which "shocked" C. W. Kellogg, president of the Edison Electric Institute, specifically refers to "swollen profits" of the utilities now. It cites official reports by utility groups of this swollen condition. Mr. Kellogg's own group reports that Commonwealth and Southern for the first six months of 1943, after paying all operating charges, made a net profit of \$7,331,000, its best showing in ten years, and that Consolidated Edison of New York, for the second quarter of 1943, showed a net profit of \$5,869,000, an increase over the corresponding three months of 1942 of 25 percent.

Mr. Kellogg blandly ignores his own figures and makes a comparison between the comparatively unregulated days of 1930, when profits were sky high, and the stricter regulation of this period which his group and a number of pro-utility

state commissions are trying to bring to an end by efforts to hamstring the Federal Power Commission.

If Mr. Kellogg wants to experience a real shock he should study the report just issued by the Hydro Electric Commission of Ontario. This shows that in 1930, the year selected by President Kellogg for his test, the gross annual revenue in Ontario's territory was \$10,752,720 and in 1942 its gross had risen to \$15,022,931.

The same report showed that the average cost of electricity per kilowatt hour in the Ontario area had dropped in 1942 to 1.23 cents. Ontario serves 560,000 customers. The low residential rate paid by these consumers has increased the use of power so that consumers are now getting four and one-half times as much power for the same dollar as they received in 1914. In addition Ontario is contributing immensely to Canada's war effort and makes no protest against strict regulation.

Mr. Kellogg of course will argue that the Canadian yardstick does not apply to United States electric plants. He cannot, however, brush aside the report of his own and other utility groups. The best he can do is the old conjuring trick of pulling a stuffed property rabbit labeled "1930" out of an old plug hat. Incidentally, the Edison Electric Institute was conspicuously active in the recent pro-utility convention of the National Association of Utility Commissioners in Chicago which clamored for the shackling of the Federal Power Commission and other federal regulatory bodies. One of these days the inside story of that convention should be told.

Harrisburg, Pa.

RICHARD J. BEAMISH

For Real Freedom of Speech

SIR: The imminence of another election moves me to consider one of the incongruities in democracy, the lack of freedom of speech.

This statement will be challenged immediately. If we mean by freedom of speech, the right to talk, then we have freedom of speech. But if we mean by freedom of speech the opportunity for our words to reach a receptive audience, no matter where they live in this country or what papers they read, then we have no such freedom. Today our words reach the public effectively only by use of the communicating machinery of the press and radio. Today freedom of speech must include easy accessibility to the press and the radio. It is obvious that we do not have freedom of speech in localities where the press is controlled by a single individual or by a group of individuals. It is evident that we do not have freedom of speech when access to the radio is made difficult to those who have a point of view but who have no financial means or whose point of view may conflict with the standards established by the radio stations. These standards are not necessarily those of the public, but those provided by the management of the radio networks.

Perhaps it is not feasible to furnish this wide latitude of freedom of speech to every citizen of this country just because he may feel that he has something to say. But there are certain situations which demand such freedom. One such condition is during election campaigns. At such times the all-inclusive freedom of speech should be available to the candidates of every legitimate political party. In all fairness to both the candidate and the electorate itself, such freedom is indispensable. If a candidate or his party cannot afford to buy that privilege, he certainly cannot convey his ideas to the electorate.

Provision for such freedom of speech should be made available in the press only by legislation . . . [which] could furnish the machinery for equal space during election campaigns to all legal political parties without cost to candidate or party. The same machinery could make equal radio time available, if the radio networks themselves cannot see the value of providing this community service.

Naturally the cost for such a freedom would become an issue. Such a freedom belongs to the people and the people would pay for it by taxation as they now pay for other services and other freedoms that they have and hope to attain. Legislation could provide special funds for political sections in the newspapers during a designated period of time for each election. The same could be done with radio time, if the radio owners did not find it feasible to offer it themselves. Such space and time should be obtained without loss and without undue profit to the newspapers or radio stations concerned. . . .

Rochester, N. Y.

HARRY L. SEGAL

Religious Reaction

SIR: I should like to comment briefly on Raphael Demos' review of Reinhold Niebuhr's "The Nature and Destiny of Man," which appeared in *The New Republic* of October 4. I carried around with me some astonishment for a few days after reading this review and then realized that the review was a typical example of the fashion in which many intellectuals have taken Dr. Niebuhr's books. They have been so impressed with his erudition, his intellectual ingenuity, his familiarity with historical thought and by his position of eminence that they have not allowed their minds the usual objectivity, nor have they wished to employ the critical method. Seldom have philosophically minded people been so disarmed as in these days by Dr. Niebuhr.

But Dr. Niebuhr's impressiveness is only a part of the story. So many intellectuals are downhearted in today's melee of strife and reaction that they have lost both determination and perspective. The result is that the time is ripe for a philosophically ingenious revival of doctrinal Christianity. The interesting thing therefore is that not only do we have a return to reactionary theology (in a new, sophisticated dress) but we have it at a time when conditions are as favorable for it as when it flourished before.

It is unfortunate to have reaction in religion at a time when faith in man, and determination that he should drive through this period with confidence in his endowments, are needed as never before. Christianity will suffer in the future for its present theological trend, and it is not alone the intellectual fallacies of the continentally influenced theologians, but their failure to sustain man's confidence in himself that will be increasingly evident when this crisis is through.

New York City

DALE DEWITT

From The New Republic Mail Bag

"Private USMCR" writes us from Georgia to say that while soldiers are willing to accept regimentation, realizing it is a military necessity, those men who have received the benefits of higher education would like to have the assurance that they are fighting for something worth while. "... There must be more than mere victory in the field. Military triumph alone will not satisfy us. We want a victory of internationalism; we want no complicated tangle of treaties, alliances and ententes. We want the beginning of the parliament of man. . . ."

Miss Rose Pesotta, vice-president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, writes us as follows:

In summarizing my letter urging repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, in your October 25 issue, you speak of me as "censuring" the AFL for instructing its executive council, at the Boston convention, to study thoroughly the question of revising immigration laws affecting Orientals. My comment that in this crucial period "there is no time for 'studying' these antiquated statutes" was intended as a *lament* rather than *censure*. Will you be good enough to set me straight with your readers by publishing this?

Books in Review

For Otis

STILL FINDING IT hard to believe that he is dead, I want to set down some of the things I remember about Otis Ferguson. "Missing in action against the enemy and must be presumed lost" was the message, or the sense of the message, that the Coast Guard sent to his family. Later information destroyed what small hope was left by the word "presumed." He was on a cargo vessel that was bombed and sunk. Almost all the men on deck were saved, but Otis had gone to the galley for a cup of coffee and there is not much chance that his body will be found. I thought how we live and die by the same habits: here at The New Republic Otis was always going downstairs for coffee. He was always talking about the sea and about sailors' never getting credit for the work they do. After Pearl Harbor, it was like him to ship as an able seaman in the merchant marine—the most dangerous service open to him at a time when half a dozen of our ships were being sunk every day.

I first saw him in the autumn of 1933. He was a lean, swarthy, rather saturnine young man with decided opinions about books and people, often spoken from the corner of his mouth. He didn't talk much about himself, but he told me that he had served four years in the Navy after enlisting at the age of seventeen. He then attended Clark University, where he was editor of the senior yearbook, besides winning one of the first prizes in a New Republic college writing contest. Now that he was trying his luck as a free lance, he wondered whether we couldn't give him a book to review. . . . I gave him a book, one that other reviewers were praising extravagantly. Otis reported next week that its author had laid a precious egg.

When an unknown reviewer disagrees violently with the whole critical press, it is an editor's job to decide whether he knows what he is talking about. I discussed the book with Otis for nearly an hour, and not without heat; people rarely succeeded in talking to him calmly. He would rise from his chair, shouting and waving his arms, and sometimes his victim shouted back, but there were no hard feelings afterwards. This time Otis won his point; I didn't agree with him, but I felt that he had good reasons for his opinions and that it was our job to print them.

In December, when books for review were scarce, Bruce Bliven suggested that he try his hand at movie criticism. It was the following summer, if I remember correctly, that he became a salaried member of the staff. It was in 1936 that, besides his movie reviews, he began writing his brilliant series of articles on swing music and musicians. The boys in the big name-bands, who were reading The New Republic for the first time in their lives, said that he was the only writer who came anywhere near expressing what they were trying to do. Rereading some of these articles today, I regret more than ever that they weren't published as a book. The fact was that Otis signed a contract for it, but had a disagreement with his publisher and never bothered to find another. The title of Dorothy

Baker's novel, "Young Man with a Horn," was borrowed with his permission from the fine piece he did on Bix Beiderbecke; and that wasn't the only occasion when he helped inspire other people to write novels that he should have written himself.

He was one of the people who can write for deadlines and only for deadlines. At The New Republic in those days, the final moment when copy could reach the printer's in Brooklyn was ten o'clock on Monday morning. Otis would sometimes arrive there in a taxi at 10:05, after sitting up all night over his article, and would make his final corrections standing beside the linotype. If he had more time, he would simply make more corrections, in hope of attaining an ideal that preëxisted in his mind. The ideal was to be, not a man of ideas, but simply "a writer, a clean writer with discipline, with the true flash which can make a thing suddenly tender or explosive."

He was a good editor, as you might expect; he could take a vastly overwritten manuscript and trim it down into something terse and effective. He was also a continual problem to his colleagues, who sometimes felt that he had lived since childhood with the imp of the perverse. If you said "white" to him, Otis said "black." If you made the mistake of saying "genius," quick as a flash he answered "phony." He was a genius himself at letting the sawdust out of stuffed shirts, but there were times when he mistook his target and drew blood instead.

Writing in one of his abusive moods, he made you think a little of Westbrook Pegler, though with a wilder humor. There was another difference, too, and it was all in Otis's favor. Pegler likes to attack people who can't hurt him if they answer back; he is most eloquent about injustice when it is suffered by the rich and powerful. The people whom Pegler defends are precisely those whom Otis couldn't bear. Let him meet somebody with influence, somebody who could give him a job or make his fortune, and he was likely to become profane, perhaps spilling drinks on the carpet. You simply couldn't picture him working for Roy Howard. On the other hand, he was never anything but kind to the suffering or timid or penniless, including dozens of young writers he met in the course of his work. I don't know how many there were for whom he revised manuscripts or bought meals or found jobs. When he went back to sea, he became an active member of the National Maritime Union, the one that Pegler seems to hate more than he does Hitler.

A letter from Betty Huling, who worked beside him in the office, gives a clearer picture of Otis than anything else I have read, besides carrying his story up to date:

That Otis! There was never anyone like him. Suddenly you'd find yourself in an argument with him—over nothing—and he would progress at dizzying speed from mildly disagreeable personalities to really wounding insults, the veins standing out on his forehead meanwhile. Then you'd vow never to talk to him again—too upsetting. The next day you'd be home with a cold, feeling very low in your mind. Otis would telephone from the office to find out why you weren't at work. That

afternoon he would arrive, bringing a jug. First he'd make you a drink, and then maybe he'd do one of his outrageous imitations—impossibly exaggerated but with an unmistakable core of truth—generally of some pompous or silly individual we both knew, or maybe, if you were lucky, of his Gramp Samyel on the farm back in Ware, Massachusetts. Meanwhile he'd be waiting on you hand and foot, tender as a mother. You'd realize you were fonder of him than of anyone else in the world.

Oat had artistic integrity; he lacked the ability to compromise. He was a completely personal critic, too subjective for impartiality, but when you read him on jazz, books or the movies, you knew you were getting his honest opinion and that no considerations of log-rolling, discretion or possible advantage to himself entered into it.

He distrusted the war—all wars, I suspect. He set the artist's value on life and couldn't bear to see it squandered to advance the interests of the Mr. Bigs. He believed this war was primarily in their interest, but it was also for the preservation of the individual, and he had to fight for the right of a man to live his own life. So he joined the merchant marine. He told me something of his trip to Archangel (August, 1942). It was the largest and best guarded convoy of the war up to that time, with an aircraft-carrier, two submarines, three or four cruisers and a covey of destroyers. For nearly three days they had an umbrella of German planes over them. The carrier was the focus of attack. Otis said a cloud of planes came over it. He turned his back because he didn't want to see the kill. Then he heard a shout from the men around him and looked again. She had come through that first wave of planes, and at the end of the third day, though badly damaged, was still with the convoy. He saw two ships, carrying cargoes of dynamite and with men aboard he knew, blown up—so near that he could see the flying fragments of bodies. They lost one-third of the convoy.

Otis made some good friends in the merchant marine and loved to talk about them. There was a fantastic story of how he and some of his pals got away with a couple of barrels of beer from a canteen (in Iceland, I think, though it probably should be a military secret) and successfully carried out the difficult maneuver of stowing them safely on board their ship in the dead of night.

I have just heard from his brother Stanley, who talked to the first officer of a vessel on which Oat had shipped, that he was the ship's delegate and very popular with the men. The first officer also said that he was a fine seaman. I think Otis, with his love of craftsmanship, would have valued that compliment more highly than any he ever received.

MALCOLM COWLEY

"Neither Jew Nor Greek"

The Apostle, by Sholom Asch. Translated from the Yiddish by Maurice Samuel. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 804 pages. \$3.

THE ATTRACTION of Sholom Asch for the American Sunday school is one of the most bizarre literary romances on record. Asch is a famous Yiddish novelist, lovingly and homogeneously Jewish, the folklorist of those East European *Luftmenschen* who are dying today in Hitler's gas chambers. He is as far from Christianity as can be imagined; for all his prodigious research into its origins in the synagogue, he has never, as one sees from his purely historical analysis of Paul in this book, really inquired into its inner life. For thirty years and more, however, Asch has been possessed by a kind of nostalgia for Jesus, a need to

restore Jesus to Israel and concurrently (a point distressed orthodox Jews have missed) to light up the moral genius of Israel before the world. Unlike the Mohammedans, who had the worldly prudence, so to speak, to enroll Jesus among their saints, most Jews have never been able to acknowledge him at all. Jews like Asch have never ceased to be haunted by him. Asch's Jesus is not the wistful prophet wistfully disengaged from the higher criticism, nor has he anything in common with the benign culture-hero of Renan and Emerson. He is a Jew among Jews, the militant Rabbi Yeshua ben Joseph of Nazareth—a Jew who preached loyalty in the synagogue, whose teachings are often reflected in the Torah and in Hillel, and who was neither the first Jew nor the last to suffer for representing God not only as a person, but as an idea of human excellence.

Yet though Asch went forth in search of Yeshua, he fell among the tired lambs of the Epworth League. What his own people would not accept, a large middle-class Protestant (or perhaps ex-Protestant) audience has accepted gratefully. Spiritually irritable and emotionally impoverished, too often Christian by habit, it has recaptured a fresh personal emotion before Christ from the hands of a Jewish novelist who had wished to remind his own people that Yeshua was one of their own. These days Bible stories are for children, or by Lloyd Douglas. Asch astonished and invigorated his audience by giving them a new sincerity, against the unexpected background of the synagogue. And his Jesus was still, like the Yeshua who embodies the central aspirations of Western civilization, a plastic figure of whom anything could be made: he was not different in essence from the Jesus whom the synoptic Gospels portray as something less than the perpetually dying and ascending God of Catholic imagery.

Paul is another matter, however, and so complex, mystical and Christian a matter that Asch misses him. It is easier to transform Jesus into a Utopian socialist—a popular literary wish—than it is to remove one knot from the Pauline tangle. We not only know Paul as a person and as an author, as the founder of the nascent Christian congregations: we know that he was the battleground on which Judaism and Hellenism were joined to the Roman imperial idea. And we must accept him as the greatest single force in the transformation of Jesus into the Christ. It is a long way from Yeshua and Nazareth to the Grand Inquisitor; it is even longer from the synagogue to the Paul who cried: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Asch, though he pursues Paul as doggedly as Francis Thompson was pursued by the hound of heaven, misses the significance of the mystic chase—which does not lie in the measure of its intensity or piety, but in the equating of the longing for human surrender with the human will.

No student of Paul has ever doubted that he was a Jew; even, by his proud confession, a Pharisee. But the Paul who lives in his letters was something more—Jew and Greek, and by his own boast, neither; an artist and an imperialist of the Christian idea, but above all one of those who could feel the full force of Dostoevsky's saying—"If anyone proved to me that Christ was not in the truth, and it really was a fact that the truth was not in Christ, I would rather be with Christ than with the truth." There is no such compulsion in Asch's Paul, no such radical modification of his

Hebraicism as will explain why so fanatical a Pharisee (as Asch represents him) should have become so ecstatic and illuminated a Christian mystic. He is laborious, not driven; wild, but not possessed. Yet if the great and tortured art of Paul's letters reveals anything about him, it is that he was one of the saintly demons of the human imagination, one who shattered the habits of men's minds by imposing his personal vision on their simplest conception of life. There is a kind of terror that such men bring against normality, a welcome terror—but it is a terror that springs from entirely new roots in the human imagination, not merely from an unusual response to old institutions.

I do not deny that Paul can and must be explained in naturalistic terms, whether it be the naturalism of modern historical and psychological analysis, or the philosophical study of Christian metaphysics. But it is one thing to describe the environment of an idea, as literary historians are fascinated with origins; it is quite another to define its essential quality, however little we may care for it. I could never tell, in reading "The Apostle," whether Asch was trying to adopt Paul or to study him; whether his method was Biblical or scientific (the division is unfortunate and arrogant, but I did not make it). When Dostoevsky's Prince Myshkin, another Christian epileptic, falls into a fit, it is either a warning of some undue emotion or the revenge of his body on his spirit. Myshkin is wonderful in his purity, and almost the Russian Jesus; but we know him in his human weakness because we respect completely his capacity for exaltation. Asch's Paul is a real man who behaves unreally; Myshkin is almost supra-human, yet poignant. We never know, though modern psychology has made so much of Paul's epilepsy, whether Asch's Paul sees the light on the road to Damascus because of his aberration or despite it; or whether, as regards Paul's access to angels and godly thunder, Asch is a realist or a nominalist. The light that burns before Paul is presumably in Paul himself; I cannot believe that Asch is superstitious. But I cannot tell what his fictional medium is—the legend, the modern "psycho-biography," or a humorously free realism.

Asch's tradition in the novel is not ours, of course; closer to Richardson than to Joyce, it is one which falls naturally into the panoramic, and though it has created solid monuments in fiction, can seem empirical and coarse. Nothing is merely suggested, and everything is fully described; the settings are elaborate, characters make their entrances as if to begin a recitative and aria, and communication is through oratory. Yet it is because Asch fails to realize Paul as an idea that he has had to write all around him at such oppressive length. All the sacerdotal East is brought in, and the Mediterranean pleasure cities, and Rome—a succulent, damned pagan Rome. And an old suffering Jew, bearing the Christ, plods after them all—urging them hotly to repent and to seek a Yeshua who has strangely become his God. But if he were really Paul, we would not need so wide a stage; and if he were really Paul, we would know why he was "neither Jew nor Greek," but mystical, tormented and universal. We would even know better how Reb Yeshua was taken over by the Grand Inquisitors, and why the Grand Inquisitors—having stolen from Paul to enthrone Peter—still sit in the thrones of the Christ.

ALFRED KAZIN

Two vital books by Gustav Stolper

THIS BOOK IS TEACHING OUR ARMY ABOUT GERMANY!

A work of such outstanding importance that it has been adopted by leading colleges and universities as a textbook in army courses.

"..An extremely valuable contribution."
—RAYMOND L. BUELL, *N.Y. Times*

"... His book is one which must claim the close attention of all who seek to understand the sources of German strength and weakness."—*The Statist*

GERMAN ECONOMY, 1870-1940

A FIGHTING LIBERAL PROBES THE MYTHS OF OUR TIME

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Why Age of Fable	Have and Have-not Nations
State and Government	The Economic Causes of War
Perfect Capitalism	Britain's Degeneracy
Perfect Planning	British Imperialism
Inflation and Deflation	Russian Experiment
Gold	The German Miracle
Production for Profit vs. for Use	Decadent Democracy and Efficient Dictatorship
Poverty amidst Plenty	

"... A distinguished achievement of the liberal spirit, the kind of lucid, temperate, yet thoroughly vigorous commentary on the state of civilization that John Locke or John Stuart Mill might have offered if they had lived in the twentieth century ..."
—WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN, *The Atlantic Monthly*

"The chapters are actually exciting ... For the average intelligent citizen, there is a whole education in this book ..."
—*Cleveland Plain Dealer*

"Here is a book that should be welcomed by anyone willing to put his concepts of the world to a sharp test ... Mr. Stolper has made a notable contribution to the greatest social understanding there can be, the knowledge of the realities we have lived by and shall continue to live by."
—RAYMOND GRAM SWING, *The Nation*

THIS AGE OF FABLE

Each volume \$3.00

Reynal and Hitchcock, New York

Ring-around-a-Rosi

Meet Mr. Blank: The Leader of Tomorrow's Germans, by Countess Waldeck. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 179 pages. \$2.50.

THE FUTURE CONSTITUTION of Germany, and by constitution is meant Germany's post-war system of social, political and economic relations and class stratification, is too serious a matter to be taken lightly. The correct, or at least an approximate, prognostication of the power situation in post-Hitler Germany would be of real service to the peace-makers. There is nothing of this in Countess Rosi Waldeck's book. It is a fantastic melange of distorted historical facts, highly irresponsible fiction, some cleverly concealed propaganda and immature political philosophy.

Who will be the leader of Germany after Hitler falls? The Countess does not answer her own question. For the Countess is in love. Perhaps she is only infatuated. But like all lovers, she is blind. She is in love with Prince Louis Ferdinand, grandson of the late Kaiser, who "has sex appeal, and has moved around the world"; with Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, whose smile "has a puckish charm"; with Dr. Friedrich Gauss, Undersecretary of State of the German Foreign Office, behind whose "bloodlessly correct surface beats a kind heart"; with Dr. Carl Clodius, also of the Foreign Office, "a tall heavy man with a light voice, smiling ways and excellent manners"; with Fritz Thyssen, the industrialist, who "looks everywhere like a distinguished foreigner"; with Otto Strasser, the ex-Nazi, who "knows sweetness and light when he sees them and is a man of the world"; with Hermann Goering, Nazi Number Two, who "makes American newsreel audiences chuckle with delight and something akin to sympathy" and who "has contributed a lot to what gayety there is inside Hitler's Germany"; with Otto Meissner, Secretary of State to Presidents Ebert, Hindenburg and Hitler, who "is smoothness personified"; with Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, president of the Reichsbank, who takes time out from important conferences "to drink tea with fragile, amusing and unattainable ladies"; with Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber, who "had no fondness for the Weimar Republic, with its Marxist slant and its indifference to religion"; with Pastor Martin Niemoller, the Christian martyr, who hoped he could make Hitler "see the light" and "went home a disillusioned man"; and with a number of minor characters, even some fictitious labor leaders and liberals.

This kind of chatting will make pleasant reading for the type of ladies whom Helen Hokinson so delightfully portrays in *The New Yorker*. It is the kind of political insight one expects from a sophisticated debutante who "has been around" in the "right circles." But its very innocence makes the book dangerous. Fact and fiction, information and misinformation, sound statements and misinterpretation are so inextricably mixed up that the casual reader will be hopelessly lost in this maze of intellectual buccaneering. For this is precisely what the book is. It combines well known truths with equally well known platitudes concerning Germany, and in doing so it conceals, badly indeed, the conservative prejudices of its author. It is a feeble attempt to make the German ruling classes respectable. It is

a fresh attempt at appeasement. For, the author threateningly warns, "there is a strong possibility that on the morning after Hitler Germany may go Communist."

Space does not permit a refutation of the Countess' dozens of irresponsible allegations. One example may suffice. "It is a strange fact," she writes, "that the few popular heroes and martyrs that anti-Nazi opposition has produced in Germany stem from the most conservative Germany—not, as some might hope, from the so-called progressive Germany." No, there is no place in the scheme of things of Countess Waldeck for the hundreds and thousands of Germans who went through the hell of Gestapo concentration camps. They do not "count." Could it be, perhaps, that fear of them inclines the Countess to make acceptable to her American audience such scoundrels as Hermann Goering and Dr. Schacht?

HEINZ H. F. EULAU

Poetry of the Immediate

Afternoon of a Pawnbroker and Other Poems, by Kenneth Fearing. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 49 pages. \$2.

OF ALL MODERN POETS Fearing has been, perhaps, the one most sympathetic to those elements of the world which strike us as fundamentally unpoetic. When Eliot or Auden approach the banal, it is with the glint of unmitigated antagonism in their eyes, either in bitter irony or revolutionary menace. Fearing has been both revolutionary and ironic, but with a difference. He was at once both a member and spectator of his own vivid and eclectic environment—an environment of Bohemians and gamblers, drunks and poets, dreamers of revolution and perfect poker-hands.

His earliest book, "Angel Arms," found him most deeply concerned with the discord between his sensitivity to this world and his inheritance of a poetic tradition. Later, he is more assured of his poetic mission. The discord becomes the basis for intense collisions between poetic sensibility and the world in which it resides. In his second volume may be found poems of explosive power, ironic fragmentations of metropolitan existence and lyric memorials of daily chaos.

But successful as this exploitation of the immediate undoubtedly was, it entailed definite sacrifices. The form was slight and often watered down into prosiness. The irony was without clear values and tended to be blanketing rather than discriminatory. The negation of intellectual tradition tended to foster sentimentality and the advertisement of seemingly latent, but actually nonexistent, profundities.

These faults persist. In the present volume, the title-poem describes a pawnbroker, who is visited by Gabriel and Adam and holds various legendary pledged articles. The events themselves are pointless (though a seeming point is advertised) except as they occasion the rather easy humor of the humdrum suddenly electrified by apparitions too big for it. In "Thirteen O'Clock," the corpses in a cemetery beg the living to stop haunting them. The transposition is amusing but the end is again advertisement, this time, with hobgoblins. "King Juke" is an attempt to lug a juke-box into poetry by animating it. Disney is more successful at the

same game. In "The Joys of Being a Business Man," the irony of realistic statement collapses into journalistic flatness accompanied by the fixed grimace of habitual mockery. Among the best poems in the volume are "Art Review," a clever fantasy on mustache-artists and privy-wall murals, a poem on Representative Dies—a perfect runway for Fearing's take-off—and a poem called "Certified Life," a mildly ironic discourse with exceedingly apt illustrations on the theme that we all have "a patent on life," be it love, chess or knowledge.

A considerable change has taken place since Fearing's last volume. His original excitement, the kind of auto-intoxication that produced the unexpected image or the startling juxtaposition, has cooled somewhat and there is little to replace it. With maturity has come a clearer focus and a greater control of his material, but there is a perceptible lack of the imaginative extravagance and casual marksmanship so well adapted to this genre. In all, though, Fearing still succeeds in obtaining a considerable exchange-value from his special brand of direct commerce between the poetic and the unadorned commonplace.

WILLIAM POSTER

The Golden Legend

The Glorious Adventures of Tyl Ulenspiegel, by Charles de Coster. Translated by Allan Ross Macdougall. Introduction by Camille Huysmans. Illustrated by Frans Mase-reel. New York: Pantheon Books. 496 pages. \$3.50.

IT IS GOOD to have de Coster's "Ulenspiegel" in a readable translation at a price only slightly higher than that of a current popular novel. It is a minor annoyance, however, for the publishers to call it "the first complete English translation" in view of the one by Atkinson, which was presented to an American public in 1922 and which for many readers will remain preferable to the present one.

Out of the "bloody legend" of the struggle of the Flemish people against Spanish tyranny de Coster wrought the "golden legend" of "Ulenspiegel," to employ Malraux's classic formulation of the genesis of revolutionary literature. History, folklore and patriotism combine to produce one of the first, and still one of the few, epic novels of modern times. Although it is set in the sixteenth century, written in archaic Flemish, deeply indebted to the early picaresque novel, chiefly and not always too happily to Cervantes, it is a nineteenth-century book. It is, moreover, of that nineteenth century which survives; de Coster was the contemporary of Daumier, Marx and Zola—our contemporaries.

For of what age did de Coster write when "on the earth armies clashed together like walls of bronze"?

Towns, villages, harvests burned amid cries and tears. . . . Black horsemen, numerous and close arrayed as bands of ants, sword in hand, pistol in hand, were smiting men, women, children. Some made holes in ice and buried old men alive in them; others cut off women's breasts and sprinkled pepper on the place; others hanged children in the fireplaces. Those who were tired of killing violated some girl or some woman; drank, played dice, and tossing over piles of gold, the fruit of pillage, dabbled their red fingers in it.

For whom did he ask

Vengeance for the bygone tears, the woes of the people;

The extraordinary book that shows you *exactly*

HOW battles are planned . . .

WHY battles are won or lost . . .

WHAT can be anticipated under given conditions . . .

THE FRAMEWORK OF BATTLE

THE LAYMAN'S GUIDE TO THE TECHNIQUE OF WARFARE

By Lieut. Col. John G. Burr

U. S. A. (Retired)

"The first real effort I have seen to make comprehensible to the ordinary reader the realities of military strategy and the progress that goes on in the mind of a general faced with a military problem."—Fletcher Pratt.

Illus. with 54 unique tableau maps. \$3.00

They helped to bust up Hitler's front doorstep . . .

EAST COAST CORVETTE

By Nicholas Monsarrat

Lieutenant, R. N. V. R.

Among the best literature this war has produced is this "brief, sharply worded yet sensitive and even humorous story of what goes on in the convoy patrol, written by a man of discernment. . . . Subtle yet compelling realism . . . poignant. . . . Reveals seamanship without bombast and human understanding without overemphasis."—Lincoln Colcord, N. Y. *Herald Tribune*. \$1.50

The warm human document of a surgeon whose power of understanding is as great as his skill of healing—

A SURGEON'S WORLD

By Max Thorek, M.D.

"There is nothing to equal it. I am charmed with it, and never read anything better in all my experience."—Dr. Arthur Hertzler, author of *The Horse and Buggy Doctor*. Dr. Thorek's stories of the Chicago slums, of operations performed in squalid niches and rolling ships' cabins, or of the white-tiled operating room at the American Hospital (which he helped to found) emerge into a beautiful and wise and realistic autobiography. . . . a "Doctor Book" unlike all others. \$3.75

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY • Philadelphia • New York

vengeance for the lords that hunted human game upon their lands; vengeance for the fruitless battles, the blood spilt in prisons, men burned and women and girls buried alive; vengeance for the fettered and bleeding past. (*Both passages translated by F. M. Atkinson.*)

Frans Masereel's illustrations for this edition are very good, but only an artist who combined the earthiness of the elder Breughel, the monstrosity of Hieronymous Bosch and the passion of Käthe Kollwitz could render fully the spirit of this book.

GEORGE MAYBERRY

A Reader's List

THE PILLARS OF SECURITY, by Sir William H. Beveridge (Macmillan, \$2.50). In this thoughtful and highly persuasive collection of wartime essays and addresses, Sir William points to his renowned report on social security as but one means of combat against social evils. While retirement pensions, unemployment insurance and provision for medical treatment may successfully deal with the specter of want, the "giants" of squalor, disease, ignorance and idleness will remain unless an all-inclusive program is developed. Sir William agrees that "cradle-to-grave" proposals alone have but limited application; the building of the pillars of democracy—full employment, peace and social security—must start with an agenda designed to eliminate all the evils. The volume, which is simply written and with no technical details, provides an excellent background and summary of Sir William's larger report on social insurance.

THE AXIS ON THE AIR, by Harold Ettlinger (Bobbs-Merrill, \$2.75). Mr. Ettlinger, who borrowed his title from his column in *The Chicago Sun*, has mixed all the usual stories of the Radio War with much that is news. He has written short biographies of the traitor broadcasters (Haw-Haw, etc.), told the myriad tales of the Underground and added new information about that "Christian Gentleman" Franco, friend of the State Department and the Foreign Office. People who glibly talk of fighting Russia should read this book to learn how well they aid Dr. Goebbels in his work. In the last few chapters, Mr. Ettlinger raises the question: Are we to continue to fight a war of negative propaganda, of fine but vague generalities like the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms? Or can we produce a unified political policy, agreed on by all the United Nations, to send the entire world on the road to a real, democratic New Order?

THE OUTLOOK FOR DOMESTIC AIR TRANSPORT, by Ernest W. Williams Jr. (National Planning Association Pamphlet No. 21, 25 cents). Although debunking the idea that land transport will have its post-war throat cut, the author anticipates great aviation advances in the near future. He maintains that air transport is essentially complementary to surface carriers. His further prognosis is that neglected aspects of the industry, such as air cargo and air express, will grow most. One of the more promising potentialities of aviation is the practicability of international commercial flights, of which the Air Transport Command is giving daily demonstration. (Although international aviation is essentially a political problem, it is one that is periodically kicked in the pants by technological advances.) Thrilling question marks of the future like the Northrup Flying Wing, helicopters and jet propulsion are parts of a total picture which lead Mr. Williams to conclude: "The future of aviation is brilliant."

THE TRIUMPH OF LIFE: POEMS OF CONSOLATION FOR THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD, edited and with an introduction by Horace Gregory (Viking, \$2.50). Despite the forbidding title and the equally viscous headings to the various sections into which the poems are divided, this is a well chosen anthology of English and American verse. Along with the deservedly familiar are a number of poems which have rarely, if ever, been included in an anthology before. Surprisingly for a modernist, Mr. Gregory's taste runs to the post-romantics, but this serves to give his book an occasional extravagance and warmth that has been missing in recent anthologies chosen from the stringent viewpoints of humanism and the new neo-classicism.

Contributors

HEINZ H. F. EULAU was until recently Senior Propaganda Analyst for the Department of Justice. He has a doctorate in Political Science from the University of California and contributes to many journals in the fields of politics and economics.

ALLAN SPALDING was graduated from Columbia University in 1942. He studied criticism and poetry under John Crowe Ransom at Kenyon College, where he won the Literary Prize Scholarship. He is at present doing economic-research work.

WILLIAM POSTER is writing a play in verse and working on a translation of "Nadja," by André Breton.

HELP WANTED

WASHINGTON (D. C.) reporter-secretary five afternoons a week. A good opportunity for a Washington secretary who thinks she would like to take a whirl at newspaper business or for married ex-newspaper woman who wants part-time job and who has some secretarial competence. Work would start about November 1. Take adequate space to tell background and experience. Job could easily develop into full-time, but hesitate to pledge this. Box 400, *The New Republic*.

LANGUAGES

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet R. **LANGUAGE SERVICE**, 18 East 41st Street, New York City.

Order your books—all books mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.

POSTAGE FREE

from **NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS**
40 E. 49th St., New York 17, N. Y.

WEARING APPAREL

TOO MUCH clothes shopping may cause mental indigestion. Miss Goodman's Dress Shop offers the solution. Her natty clothes (Dresses, Coats, Suits) are simple, smart, hard to find. 362 Lexington Ave., near 41st St. MU 5-0670.

The classified rate of *The New Republic* is 50¢ a type line for 6 point (6 words to the line) and 45¢ a type line for 5 point (7 words to the line). The minimum ad in both cases is three lines.

Advertising Department

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

OUR MEN NEED * BOOKS *



**SEND
ALL YOU CAN SPARE**

That book you've enjoyed — pass it along to a man in uniform. Leave it at the nearest collection center or public library for the 1943

★
**VICTORY
BOOK
CAMPAIGN**